The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1906.

The Week.

While the full scope and effect of the decision of the Supreme Court on Monday, in the Chesapeake and Ohio case, cannot be gathered from the fragmentary press reports, some things are clear. One is that the courts may be depended upon, in the end, to brush aside the fictions by which corporations attempt to evade the plain intent of the law. This is the outstanding feature of Justice White's opinion. A railroad cannot be, now a carrier, now a dealer. It cannot do as a dealer what it is forbidden to do as a carrier. The word "indirectly" in the Interstate Commerce act takes off the cover from a multitude of sins—such as that by which the Chesapeake and Ohio sought to give itself, as dealer, a lower rate on coal than it would give to any other dealer. Once a carrier, always a carrier, says the court, and with all the obligations of a carrier to obey the law. This decision should also serve to remind Congress and the President how great are the resources of existing law, and how vast the powers of the courts which may be invoked to protect the property rights of the people. One would say, too, that this latest decision of the Supreme Court ought to strengthen the hands of those who are contending for an amendment to the Hepburn bill of a sort clearly to establish the right of judicial review.

If the Ship Subsidy bill had a chance of passing the House, it would not have passed the Senate. It is so perfectly understood that Speaker Cannon and the House leaders will not touch it, that the Senate felt it safe, after a perfunctory debate, to let it come to a vote on February 14. It is a bad bill, so vicious in some of its features that five Republican Senators refused to vote for this party measure; but almost worse than the bill itself is this reprehensible way of playing fast and loose with legislation. One year the House passes a bill which it knows the Senate will kill; next year it is the Senate's turn. Senator Gallinger and his fellows will now say to the ship-owners that they have kept their promises and paid the party debt, and that the trouble is all with a parsimonious House. But every one knows that a Republican bill which is so glaringly improper that Senator Spooner would not vote for it, had from the first no hope of getting through the House.

"Bravo! John Chinaman," says the Lahore *Panjabee;* "you have fairly brought the go-ahead, pushful, and creation-licking Yankee from his high perch." The remark is in connection with the anti-American boycott, which, as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs was told on Thursday by Mr. Denby, ex-Secretary of Legation at Pekin, was directly provoked by our Chinese exclusion laws. Even in Singapore, which is not a part of the Chinese Empire, though a majority of its inhabitants are Chinamen, the boycott is so extensive and stringent that the new street-car company found it advisable to distribute thousands of handbills in Chinese declaring that "nothing belonging to the tramway—rails, cars, screws —was made in America." Small wonder that, with such a feeling, the Pacific Mail Steamship Company should report that American trade with China is "practically gone." Much good a ship subsidy would do in such a case! The plain fact is, that we have gone blindly ahead in our dealings with the Chinese as if they had not the ordinary attributes of human beings. We thought that we could cut them and they would not bleed, could wrong them and they would not revenge. We are finding our mistake.

Only 87 Congressmen were willing on Thursday to consider a bill for abolishing or consolidating the custom-houses operated at a loss, while 163 resolutely stood by these venerable and costly institutions. It is a measure which has come up a great many times in the past, and will doubtless continue to come up in the future until Representatives are willing to put the interest of the nation and its revenues above local pride in having a custom-house. The way in which the unprofitable ports are scattered geographically makes their abolition an uncommonly difficult business. Though there are only fifty-one of them, they are distributed over twenty-four States, whose delegations, voting together, could defeat any legislation. Maine has eight, and a member from that State, Mr. Reed, threw the proposed reform out of court many years ago. Massachusetts stands next with five, and a Massachusetts member, Mr. Gardner, made the point of order which put over a bill unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee earlier in the present session. The relation between the vote and the map would not be hard to trace. The Government maintains collectors at ten ports where, with expenses of $5,160.33, not a single dollar was collected in the last fiscal year. It cost $321.38 to collect every dollar of revenue at Albemarle, N. C., $200.22 at Cherrystone, Va., $185.88 at Annapolis, Md., $125.04 at Tappahannock, Va., and $101.46 at York, Me. The system is ridiculous in theory and in practice. The only hope is that, as Congress in the past consented to have the collection of internal revenue put on a business basis, it may ultimately make the same concession for the customs.

The bill of Representative Adams of Pennsylvania, providing as punishment for wife-beaters in the District of Columbia "lashes not exceeding thirty, by means of a whip or lash of suitable proportions and strength for the purpose of this act," has been a cherished measure of his, as he declared last session, for the past twenty-three years. Last year, during the debate on the Fortifications bill, he interpolated an extremely weighty ten-column speech, reviewing the legal status of women from the time of the Egyptians down, and embellished by a statistical table showing the number of Pennsylvanians who beat their wives annually, and the nature of the punishment meted out to each. This year the Committee on the District of Columbia was persuaded to report the bill without recommendations, and the House, on the day when it resolves itself into a local Board of Aldermen, attacked it with much gusto. Mr. Adams referred to the words of the President of the United States in his message for 1904: "Probably some form of corporal punishment would be the most adequate means of meeting this kind of crime." Whipping is not the only form of corporal punishment yet devised. Members were not content to stop short with that, or with inflicting bodily suffering for only one crime. So amendments began to pour upon the clerk's desk, exemplified in Mr. Bartholdt's proposed four new sections. He would have the "male person" who neglected to support his family "put upon the rack for such a length of time as, in the opinion of the public executioner, will be an adequate punishment for the offence." Pinching with red-hot tongs he would prescribe for "male persons" who deserted their wives. In other words, arguments for mediævalism simply fetched up against the sane, wholesome American sense of humor. The bill was literally laughed into oblivion, the roll-call showing only sixty members who favored it against 153 who voted to lay it on the table.

The sentencing of George W. Beavers to two years in the penitentiary settles the case of one of the ringleaders in the post-office frauds. He is one of the men for whose conduct, President Roosevelt declared, "no excuse of any kind"

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could be alleged. It is now nearly three years since he was forced to resign as general superintendent of salaries and allowances; in the interval he has employed clever counsel, he has resorted to every legal technicality, and he has exerted strong political influence in order to evade the penalty of his misdeeds. But as he had plunged both arms up to the elbows in the public treasury, he finally saw there was no escape, and pleaded guilty of conspiring to defraud the Government. His confession bodes ill for his fellow-conspirators; for if the case against him is complete, the prosecution is likely to succeed against former State Senator George E. Green of Binghamton, who was indicted with Beavers. Much of the credit for bringing these postal thieves to justice is due to President Roosevelt, who has been absolutely unrelenting, and has given the officers of justice the heartiest support.

Not only has the talk of a few years ago against "government by commission" died down, but suggestions for the creation of new special bodies to deal with this, that, and the other subject come thick and fast. The future of the State Gas Commission happened to come into prominence at Albany last week. Yet simultaneously Tammany's orators were at the Capitol to plead for a Public Utilities Commission. Even before that the creation of a State Automobile Commission was being urged, and it was proposed to authorize a State Voting-Machine Commission to select electoral machinery for all the cities in the State. In short, the old rule for disposing of a puzzling problem by at once relieving an existing office of work, creating a set of new salaried positions, and securing a respite from criticism, has lost none of its popularity. A Chicago newspaper has recently compiled a list of the commissions now making regular reports in each of the States. New York, which with 25 stands fourth on the list, would come almost to the head if pending proposals should be adopted. The only States now having a larger number of commissions are Connecticut with 31, Wisconsin with 30, and New Jersey with 28. Ohio contrives to get along with 14, and Nevada with only 5. There is no theoretical limit to the number of possible boards. Every trade, every physical feature, every article of commerce, might have one to supervise it. Perhaps we should be thankful not to have twice as many.

The blank form to which the Independence League—alias Hearst's hired men—is inviting signatures all over the State, is as ingenious an appeal to the discontented as was ever drawn. Everybody with a grievance or a fad or a grudge or an axe to grind will find something for him in it. Hearst scarcely knows which is his consuming ambition, to give the farmer "good roads," "pure food," and "profitable markets," or the Labor Unions the right to "regulate the pay and working hours of working people"; is in doubt which he will first abolish, "discrimination in railroad rates" or "frauds against the people on the part of insurance companies." In a weak moment of fear lest his programme may alarm people with anything to lose, he put in the comic proviso that he is for "the protection of legitimate capital." This is the propaganda which is now afoot. We do not believe that citizens are at all awake to its significance. It is already gathering great headway, and threatens to change the political map of the State.

It is gratifying to have both the law and the ethics, in the matter of political contributions by life-insurance companies, passed upon so vigorously as they were on February 14 by the New York Life committee. When that company's campaign subscriptions of 1896, 1900, and 1904, were brought to light by President McCall's own testimony, there was a momentary effort, in a few quarters, to defend the action. The issues of the sound-money campaign were so vital—the insurance policyholder had so great a stake in them—that even if a long-ignored statute made contributions of the sort illegal, the less said about it the better. Apologies of this nature grew feebler when certain angry policyholders protested that they had favored the other side in the campaign, and hence that their own money had been secretly used against their own candidates. This protest appealed to the American instinct of fair play; and when, later on, Senator Platt admitted that the companies paid over money for State as well as national campaigns, no one was left to say a good word for the implicated officers. Now comes the New York Life's own committee, and, speaking for fellow-trustees and on advice of eminent counsel, declares that the contributions referred to were illegal and are recoverable at law from the officers who authorized them. Not stopping with this, the trustees adopted their committee's recommendation that suit for that purpose be at once begun. We imagine this to be the *coup de grâce* for such left-handed pilfering of insurance trust funds.

That the death of John A. McCall was hastened by the insurance scandals is not to be doubted. Rising from poverty and obscurity to the presidency of one of the most powerful corporations in the world, he was proud both of the skill which had won such success, and of the great life-insurance company which owed so much to his brilliant management. His resort to legislative corruption to compass ends which he regarded as desirable, was not so much an expression of his personal character as of the school of finance and politics in which he was bred. Born and brought up in Albany, familiar with the corridors and lobbies of the Capitol, a clerk in the Insurance Department, he naturally came to look upon the bribery of a Legislature or the purchase of a political machine as the only direct, efficient, and legitimate means of promoting good laws and killing bad. Probably he never considered the activities of Andrew Hamilton in their wider relations. Convinced that he had done nothing wrong, and that the administration of the New York Life had been above reproach, he really had no fear of the investigation. At first he was surprised, then prostrated, by the wrath of the public. He had really felt that his dabbling in legislation in the supposed interest of policyholders was to be commended rather than condemned. When he fully realized the extent to which his reputation had been smirched, he made large sacrifices of his personal fortune in order to reimburse the company for the advances to Hamilton. In doing this he showed a far higher sense of personal honor than either James W. Alexander, James Hazen Hyde, or Richard A. McCurdy. His fatal error was not that he worked for his own pocket, but that he sacrificed principle for the aggrandizement of his company.

Ohio seems to be feeling her way honestly towards a real improvement in government. As the Democrats did not dream of overturning twelve years of enormous Republican majorities, the ring element kept in the background for the most part, with the result that the average character and ability of Democrats elected was unusually high. The present Ohio Legislature is not likely to develop a group of philosophical statesmen. In an era of blind experiment, however, in which all parties are sailing without the aid of historic chart or compass, the new Democratic element in Ohio has at least shown that it is not dominated by the spirit of graft. Its only hope for success in elections to come lies in its ability to justify itself to the better class of Republicans whose votes placed it in power; and this it cannot do by any appeal to mere demagoguery. If it shall keep its attempts to regulate corporations within such bounds as to do no real harm to legitimate business, if it shall grapple successfully with the corrupting fee-system in local offices, if it shall recast the election laws with the interest of the individual in mind, rather than that of the party machine, and shall make such reasonable alterations in the local-option system as will satisfy the thousands who very naturally objected to the dictation of li-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quor regulations by George B. Cox, then the Democrats will remain an important factor in Ohio politics.

Reports conflict as to the attitude of the railroads towards the two-cent fare law recently enacted by the Ohio Legislature, but it is hardly probable that they will try to circumvent it. It has been framed in answer to a widespread conviction that a two-cent fare to all alike is more nearly just than three cents to the majority, with free travel to a host of public officials, newspaper men, and others who may be in a position to render favors to the roads. The trolley system has shown that reduced fares may bring into existence a vast volume of traffic which would not otherwise have been secured at all; and it is possible that the two-cent fare on the steam roads, in the comparatively thickly settled and prosperous communities of Ohio, may prove more profitable in the end than the higher rate which it supersedes. The counsel of wisdom is for the Ohio roads to assume this as at least a possibility, and bend every energy towards its realization. If the two-cent rate is essentially unworkable, such an attitude during the period of experiment will pave the way for a just accommodation better than the assumption from the start that an intentional injustice has been done.

By the action of the South Carolina Senate, the dispensary of that State has been saved, at least temporarily. The lower house of the Legislature had voted to abolish it. The official investigation, however, is still pending, and one of its most interesting features was the visit last week of Senator Tillman, the father of the system, to testify what he knew of the existing abuses. The Senator had previously stated that he believed the system to be honeycombed with graft, but that, if it were to be abolished, he would take the stump for outright prohibition rather than accept a system of local option. His "revelations," however, turned out to be entirely based on circumstantial evidence. He knew of no explicit cases of wrongdoing among dispensary officials. He told with some apparent bitterness of the aspersions on his own conduct in the first years of the dispensary. "There is no doubt," he said, "if I had been corrupt and wanted to make money out of my position as Governor in buying whiskey, I could have done it." As to the present officers, he thought they had no excuse for not submitting to full investigation. "Don't honey-fugle," he advised the committee, "but go to the bottom in any way possible." In spite of the death of the dispensary-repeal bill and the failure of the inquiry to reveal other than minor scandals, it seems to be the feeling that this year will see a bitter fight on some phase of the liquor question in South Carolina.

It is not because of any obvious commercial or moral gain that a truce in the "Montana copper war" is to be welcomed. That struggle has been attended from the first, however, by so notorious a debauching of courts, voters, and legislatures, and by such utter demoralization of the business communities in the tainted district, that anything was better than its continuance. Nobody comes out of the contest with clean hands, but at any rate there is now the hope of ending it. Whether the acquisition of the so-called "Heinze mines" will tempt the Amalgamated to throttle the copper trade again, as it did five years ago, may be doubted. Three of the nine most productive copper mines in this country are independent of the Amalgamated, and that company would probably hesitate to play their game as it did when it gave up the market to them, in 1901, by fixing prohibitive prices for its own output. But the promoters of the Amalgamated scheme will doubtless continue busy chiefly in working a much more valuable mine than the Boston and Montana, the Butte and Boston, or even the Anaconda, whose daily discoveries of new and unprecedentedly rich veins of copper have, for some weeks past, enlivened financial discussion. The richest veins which these explorers have as yet opened up have been found in Wall Street.

Mr. Balfour's surrender to Mr. Chamberlain is not less ignominious because long delayed. In fact, there would have been a certain dignity in accepting the Birmingham programme and staking his Parliamentary life upon it in a general election; but so clear-cut a policy would have been foreign to Mr. Balfour's temper. As things stand, he is a tardy and ungracious convert; the country has now spoken on the protection issue, and he himself has sunk from actual leadership to subserviency to Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Balfour accepts protective tariffs, even with the tax on food, which he has declared impossible, as the chief "constructive" policy of the Unionists, though convinced that the party will do no constructive work for five years to come. He presumably notes that Mr. Chamberlain is old and in uncertain health, and realizes that Mr. Chamberlain's lieutenant to-day may be his successor in the near future. Mr. Balfour knows also that his most redoubtable critics among the Free Trade Unionists, Lord Hugh Cecil, Thomas Gibson Bowles and Sir John Gorst, are out of Parliament, thanks to Mr. Chamberlain. This makes the position of leader of the Opposition at least more comfortable than that of Prime Minister was. Still, there is the Duke of Devonshire, who never strikes his flag. Finally, Mr. Balfour had to choose between coming out for Chamberlain or seeing the scanty Unionist minority split in two and his own leadership become merely nominal.

King Edward's speech from the throne on Monday did not differ apparently from the run of such documents. It did, however, forecast legislation on three very contentious matters. First, the Education act, which has been the occasion of widespread discontent among Non-conformists, is to be amended; second, a new constitution is to be granted to the Transvaal; third, a policy of consultation and conciliation is to be pursued in Irish matters. The first two proposals are of a difficult sort. To withdraw state support from the Church schools will arouse very bitter opposition from the entire Establishment. To grant the Transvaal a Constitution consistent with Liberal ideas will stir up the mining syndicates, both on the Rand and in Lombard Street. Indeed, these two engagements, for a wonder, make the Irish professions seem fairly innocuous. Even the most stolid Tory could hardly object to economy and a conciliatory spirit in Irish administration. While the terms of the King's speech would admit comprehensive Irish legislation, it is not at all likely that Campbell-Bannerman will wish to renew the schism of the early eighties. In the Commons the only thing of note was the appearance of Joseph Chamberlain as *de facto* leader of the Opposition during Balfour's temporary obscuration.

The Hungarian Diet has been dissolved and expelled by the police, and new elections will be held under a liberalized suffrage system imposed by royal decree. By a curious paradox, absolutism forces a more democratic order upon its unwilling subjects. The hope is that a more complete expression of the popular will may result in leavening the extreme Magyarism of the majority. Previous appeals to the electorate have only strengthened the Nationalist coalition. One may regret the apparently unconstitutional manner in which the Parliamentary knot has been cut, but the alternative was between some such renovation of the Diet or the complete surrender of the King. For a year the Independence party, controlling the majority, has declined either to take office itself or to support any appointee of the Crown. The contestants stuck hopelessly at the Magyar "word of command" for Hungarian troops, and all legislation was at a deadlock. Until the reassembling of the new Diet on the revised suffrage basis, the quarrel is technically at a standstill. One can hardly imagine a renovation of the Diet so complete that the Apponyi-Kossuth coalition will not still exercise a dominant influence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMAN-AMERICAN TRADE RELATIONS.

Prince von Bülow has already sent to the Reichstag the bill empowering the Bundesrath to extend to the United States the tariff given by Germany under reciprocal treaties to Russia, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, and Rumania. To defend it before the Reichstag, he has selected Count Posadowsky-Wehner, the Secretary of the Interior, perhaps in the hope that that official's friendliness to the Agrarians may help him in this hour of need. For the bill will not be passed without considerable criticism and fault-finding. The nations just mentioned obtained their treaties with Germany only after making important concessions. They will not be pleased to see the United States similarly favored in return for one or two unimportant modifications of the tariff regulations. The Social-Democrats may be relied upon to point out how quickly the Chancellor surrendered to the United States, with really not sufficient concessions, even in form, to "save his face."

Speaking for the German free traders, Dr. Theodor Barth has, according to the *Staats-Zeitung*, in a certain degree come to the rescue of the Chancellor. That is, he lays the blame for the failure to find a permanent way out of the *impasse* upon the whole German commercial and tariff policy. His unusually thorough knowledge of American affairs enables him to see that there was never much hope of inducing the Senate to do for us what the Russian, Italian, and Austrian Governments were so ready to do for their merchants and exporters. But Dr. Barth's views must make the outlook less favorable in the Reichstag, for the extension to be voted by it is to last only twelve months. What is to happen then? The *Tribune's* confidence that there will be no tariff war with Germany may seem singularly misplaced a year hence. No one who has followed the Senate's course in the last five years will delude himself into believing that the pending respite will be utilized by the Senate to confirm a reciprocity treaty, even if Mr. Root should think it worth while to submit one. And if Von Bülow must again confront the Reichstag with empty hands a year hence, his reception will be far less cordial than to-day.

There is dissatisfaction enough as it is. Cable reports state that this question is almost the sole topic of the German press to-day, the Agrarian papers distinguishing themselves by bitter attacks upon the Government. A year hence this opposition to giving the United States a good deal for nothing will be strongly reinforced by others than the selfish Agrarians and the manufacturers who loaded up with stocks of American raw or partly manufactured materials, in anticipation of a prolonged tariff war. In short, it will not do for the friends of a pacific settlement to rest on their oars during the coming twelve months because of comfortable assurances that, since Germany has more to lose by a tariff war than the United States, she will be as ready to knuckle under to us in 1907 as she has been in 1906. Speculation of this kind is dangerous at best. Moreover, Germany's protective tariffs are calling forth precisely the same manifestations of unreasoning selfishness that have marked the development of the system in this country. The Agrarians would willingly have a tariff war raise the cost of living, and thus line their pockets, while the Jingoes on both sides would welcome it as an opportunity to shake big sticks at each other. There could be no clearer illustration of the way in which protective tariffs threaten the world's peace.

To those who would clearly understand the present-day industrial relations between Germany and the United States, we cannot too strongly commend the admirable articles recently contributed by Louis J. Magee to the *Engineering Magazine*, under the title, "The American and the German 'Peril.'" From them may be obtained, not a technical discussion of tariff difficulties, but an appreciation of what each country may get from the other, and a realization of the enormous expansion in their trade relations which would come if the business men of both countries were to make a careful study of each other's methods. Germany has already been doing this on a large scale, particularly since the St. Louis Exposition, but, for too many Americans, ignorance of foreign conditions leads to a belief that there is no use in trying to find a way to increase our business abroad.

Mr. Magee, who speaks after a residence of fifteen years in Germany, optimistically believes, despite the shadow of Agrarian opposition, that "the two nations are going to understand each other better and get together in many future situations." The coming year will count heavily in deciding this matter, and this ought to stimulate all who would prevent a tariff war, with all its ugly possibilities, and also win for this country the enlarged German market to be had, not for the asking, but by comparatively small labor. As Mr. Magee says: "Industrial America, on the whole, can be proud of its export business only when every factory can, with profit, place a certain percentage of its output in the foreign market." The comparatively small percentage of that output now going to Germany is none the less endangered because Von Bülow has saved the situation for a year. The question before our financiers and manufacturers is simply whether the Senate, as now appears, is wholly beyond reach of public opinion in everything touching the tariff, and whether our business world is calmly to sit by and await the loss of one of its best customers through the sheer stupidity and indifference of our legislators.

IGNORANCE ABOUT SOUTH AMERICA.

Mr. John Barrett, formerly Minister to the Argentine Republic, and now our Minister to Colombia, is renewing his efforts to dispel "the lamentable ignorance that prevails generally throughout the United States in regard to Central and South America." Last year he offered prizes for essays by college students on historical and economic themes having to do with Spanish America. In a letter to the President of Columbia University, Mr. Barrett proposes similar prizes for the present collegiate year.

Whether several college essays of 10,000 words each will enlighten any but their writers, we should venture to doubt. Yet Minister Barrett is undoubtedly right in alleging that a vast amount of misunderstanding and prejudice characterizes our relations with the republics to the south of us, though ample knowledge is available. To say nothing of books of travel and the works of historians and statesmen, our consular reports from South America have for years been stuffed with information designed to correct the mistaken attitude of our citizens towards that region. So has our diplomatic correspondence. Mr. Barrett himself labored faithfully, when at Buenos Ayres, to get it into the heads of Americans that their stupid tariff policy was what stood in the way of better relations and better trade with the Argentine. But no visible result was ever registered. There has been no lack of seed, but it has all fallen upon stony ground. The ignorance which Mr. Barrett seeks to dissipate is largely wilful, of the kind which theologians call "judicial."

There is, however, one part of our ignorance of Spanish-Americans which is peculiarly extensive and unfortunate. We mean our total inability to appreciate their opinion of us. Naturally, we are persuaded that we are the most lovable as well as the most admirable people on earth, yet we are dimly aware, and are deeply puzzled at it, that the South Americans do not like us. They actually prefer a retrograde people like the Spaniards, or a race known to be frivolous if not wicked, such as the French; and get on better even with the stiff English! Then they talk about "sympathies" and natural affinities, and ingratiating manners and national sentiments, and other things which we do not in the least understand. There is, in fact, no more pathetic problem in international psychology than the pain-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed surprise of Uncle Sam at discovering that he is not, with his "sister republics" of this hemisphere, the irresistible charmer that he had considered himself.

We have no wish to write an essay on that subject, but the statement of a few simple facts can do no harm. If the South Americans are cold towards the United States, it is an effect defective which comes by cause. Their suspicion and dislike have plainly deepened during the past ten years. This is admitted in official circles at Washington. It is reported by European observers. A writer on President Roosevelt's foreign policy in the last *Edinburgh* records the fact as indubitable. Why is it? Bad manners undoubtedly account for something. We have persistently been overbearing and contemptuous in our dealings with the Latin Americans. The comic stage scarcely misrepresents the thing: one virile American is capable of knocking together the heads of six "dagoes." That fairly mirrors our national attitude; and it cannot be called conciliatory. In commercial relations, too, we have been blundering and tactless. After having legislated so as to make a flowing trade with South America impossible, we lay it up as a grievance against South Americans that they will not buy of us. Scarcely a session of Congress passes without an angry reference, by indignant legislators, to the fact that Brazil and the Argentine and Chili take more goods from Europe than they do from us. This, again, is not exactly lubricating.

All these things, however, might be dismissed by the South Americans as merely bad breeding and poor business, but they cannot so easily put aside the graver cause of their distrust. It is not the absence of politeness, on our part, but of justice, of which they complain. They look upon the United States as a country which has several standards of international fair dealing, and which applies its lowest and roughest to them. And this feeling of theirs has been distinctly heightened by the tone of President Roosevelt's public utterances respecting them. He has abounded, of course, in disclaimers of territorial ambition or aggrandizement at their expense. But they have a proverb, equivalent to our "deeds speak louder than words" (*hechos son amores y no buenas razones*), and they apply it to the President. Protest as he may, his real attitude, they think, is that of one who considers that they have no rights which can stand in the way of his wishes. They recall how brutally he proposed to "take the matter into our own hands" if Colombia stood upon her undoubted prerogative. And his talk about his "police power" over them, with his intention to move against them if they are "disorderly," not only offends but disquiets them. They see in it all a sign of overmastering contempt for them; and they know that, out of contempt, justice was never born.

There is clear evidence in the South American press that President Roosevelt's descent upon San Domingo has intensified the sentiment against us in all Central and South America. The question asked is, Where next is the Big Stick to fall? And if Minister Barrett were free to tell why Colombia is not ready to fall into our embraces, he would have a tale to unfold not only of foregoing wrongs, but of present refusal to do justice. Colombia is to-day, we are informed, asking our Government to agree to arbitrate the differences between the two countries growing out of the events at Panama in 1903. She urges merely that a tribunal of impartial jurists be permitted to decide whether President Roosevelt exceeded his powers, under either the treaty or the general law of nations. All such disputes, Mr. Roosevelt vehemently contended in the arbitration treaties which he urged upon the Senate last year, ought to be arbitrated; but we are told that he will not listen for a moment to Colombia's plea. Arbitrate with a dago! Permit jurists to review *my* conduct! Well, so long as such an attitude is taken, we fear that the prejudice of South Americans against us cannot be removed even by the youngest essayist in our colleges.

OUR THREAT TO CHINA.

Beyond doubt, Secretary Root has received alarming reports from our consuls in China, of a sort to make him and the President anxious about the situation in that country. They are obviously unwilling to accept the publicly expressed opinion of the Chinese Minister that there is no ground for apprehension. In a recent interview he declared that there is no probability of another Boxer uprising. The existence of a serious boycott the Minister admits and deplores, but the present anti-American movement is primarily the work of merchants and men of education, whereas the Boxer uprising was an outbreak of the lower classes, after a couple of famine years. Moreover, there are now no weak or sympathetic viceroys to connive at a revolt, as was the case in 1900. Finally, the new Chinese army affords a security not available when hordes of Boxers were assuming control of the interior.

Despite all this, there may be warrant for the formation of an expeditionary corps, or at least the grouping of certain extra troops in and about Manila in the expectation of serious trouble and the need of protecting Americans. The President may desire to be even more forehanded than in 1900, when we were able to throw two regiments into Tien-tsin with comparative speed. But the frankness with which all preparations are announced and the anxiety of the Washington officials is proclaimed to the whole world, savors too much of "shirt-sleeves diplomacy." We are wholly at peace with China; so far as the official relations of the two nations are concerned, there is not the slightest reason for the United States to prepare to violate the integrity of Chinese territory. Every one can appreciate the serious situation that would arise if the War Department were to announce that, on account of private news of impending trouble in Japan or in Italy, which might endanger the lives of American citizens, troops were being assembled at the nearest point of embarkment for the possible scene of hostilities.

Even when the war with Spain was at hand, there were various efforts to explain away the first movements of regular troops towards the South. In the case of China, however, there is no concealment of any kind. The President believes there may be trouble, and off the troops go. The purpose of their going, their rendezvous in or near Manila, the officers to command them in China, the preparatory manœuvres they are to carry out to fit themselves for service in China, are, as the Germans say, "tolled forth by a great bell." Whether the Philippine Scouts shall be employed is also discussed. In short, the whole world is informed of every step without the slightest regard for China's feelings, and apparently without inquiring whether all this will not offend the Chinese and intensify the already costly boycott. The rest of the world is strangely unmoved. The Kaiser, who was so hot for revenge and bloodshed in 1900, has not yet breathed any threats of fresh slaughter, or taken the slightest precautions to be ready, so far as is known. In England, France, and Italy, as in Germany, if there are preparations being made for another march to Pekin, due regard for the feelings of China keeps the fact locked up in the rooms of the various general staffs.

It is not surprising that members of the Asiatic Association, composed of American merchants engaged in the China trade, are reported as being "considerably disturbed" over the Washington Government's openly announced military activities. Their advices coincide with those of the Chinese Minister, and they are reported to be convinced that the current talk of an uprising is best calculated to bring it about. In our opinion, their view is correct. The educated Chinese know perfectly well that the United States would proceed in this way against no other great nation, and the facts, if not already published in China, are likely to be as widely and as quickly diffused in that Empire as have been the accounts of the American outrages against Chinese residents or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

travellers. The vice-president of the Pacific Mail Steamship Company declares that our trade in China is "practically gone," as the result of our unfair treatment of the Chinese. At the very least, the residents of China will see in our action a determinedly hostile spirit, looking only for an excuse to land an army and perpetrate again some of the horrible crimes which thoroughly disgraced the so-called Christian troops in 1900. The attitude of our Government, in brief, is one of distrust and contempt, and smacks of the same spirit which makes the average American look upon every Chinaman as an underfed and overworked laundryman, to be kicked or stoned if the policeman's back is turned.

To menace China is the wrong way to go about it. To allay the intense bitterness with which Americans are regarded in China, Congress must do justice to the Chinese nation; must adopt a treaty dealing with her subjects as with those of any other nation. She wants the assurance that her travellers will not be maltreated at our doors; that the whole Chinese population of a city like Boston shall not again be arrested in a body and shamelessly imprisoned under conditions resembling those of the Black Hole of Calcutta; that her subjects shall not be excluded when emigrants from Bohemia and Hungary and Russia are freely admitted. Failing these healing measures, there will not for years be cordial relations between the two countries. And if American troops are again landed in China, they will be opposed with a hatred more intense than that of 1900, and born of a consciousness of having suffered great injustice at our hands.

THE MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP TROUPE.

We refer to that aggregation of talent which is touring the State in the interest of Hearst as Municipal Ownership Governor. The manager of the Troupe —one remembers how "The Matthew Arnold Troupe" got reduced fares—is Mr. Max Ihmsen. He is the gentlemanly agent who set out to buy the Presidency for Hearst in 1904. To buy a mere Governorship might seem, after that, something of a come-down for one of his abilities, but we presume the commissions are satisfactory. With him are associated certain ex-politicians, ex-employees of corporations, and ex-owners of a character.

This pleasing combination of performers descends upon city after city with a fine derangement of the methods of a circus and those of the advertisers of a patent medicine. No sooner is their metaphorical tent pitched, than they clamorously call upon the public to walk up and see Hearst in his unrivalled feat of breaking the necks of three giant monopolies at once. In the streets the deft demonstrators set up their stands and open their satchels. Are you suffering from corruption? Try a box of Hearst's Municipal Ownership Pills. Is the body politic covered with blotches? One application of Hearst's Municipal Ownership Wash will be a sure cure. Meanwhile, the pavement is littered with handbills, sandwich-men parade up and down, cornets are sounded, and Tom Johnson's famous Ohio campaign in a devil wagon is far outdone by the blare and glad publicity of the Hearst Municipal Ownership assault upon the Governorship of the State of New York.

It all sounds like a bad joke, but we assure our readers that it is no laughing matter. One of Murphy's errands at Albany the other day was to ascertain the true strength of the Hearst movement up the State, and all the politicians told him that Hearst was "coming strong." There is, of course, no real Democratic organization throughout the State to withstand Hearst. What there was in 1904 was merely a shadowy personal appurtenance of David B. Hill; and now that he has let go, the remains of it are for anybody to buy. And the purchase is going on swiftly. Word has gone out that the Hearst band wagon is distinctly the one to climb into, and the rush to get aboard is reported to be furious. We hear of from 40 to 400 signatures a day being affixed to his petitions in a single county. The signers are supposed to be filled with a burning desire that Hearst become a municipally owned Governor, and that at the same time a State Legislature be elected that shall have municipal ownership written on its heart. This is the sort of evidence which is being laid before Murphy. Its effect in inclining him to the alliance which Hearst is proposing can scarcely be doubtful. For many weeks, now, the Hearst papers have not pictured Murphy in convict's garb. Nor have they shown him dining luxuriously at Delmonico's (it is well known that Hearst always dines at Dennett's) while his poor deluded followers are gnawing their nails outside. On the other hand, Murphy's personal organ has left off attacking Hearst, reserving all its fire for Mayor McClellan; while the trip of the Tammany chief to Albany to explain to the Legislature through the eloquent and suddenly converted Cockran that the Wigwam is now in favor of the control of public utilities, is a pretty good proof that Murphy perceives the private utility of joining forces with Hearst. Neither man, of course, has a single personal or political conviction that would stand in the way; and we shall doubtless soon be gazing upon the edifying spectacle of two men, of whom one has said that the other is a thief and assassin, while the other has declared the first to be an anarchistic murderer, taking sweet counsel together, all for the greater glory of municipal ownership!

The movement shows now many symptoms of a mounting craze. The very words "municipal ownership" are made a sort of mysterious and sacred symbol. An actual working plan to secure municipal ownership is the last thing the Troupe thinks of, or needs to think of. You must not ask them where they are to find the necessary money, or how they are to get around the State Constitution. Such questions imply a certain sanity in the municipal-ownership extremists, whereas they give every sign of being afflicted with a mania. Very likely, if you pressed them, they would say that Gov. Hearst might suspend the Constitution for two years, or until his plans were carried out. Reason, measure, the hard facts of finance, the ugly facts of politics are all left out of the reckoning. What is expected is that there will be a great rallying of the disappointed and discontented, of place-hunters and amiable enthusiasts and the mildly crack-brained, who, together with the labor-union vote and the Tammany vote, are to win Hearst the Democratic nomination for Governor and sweep him into office. What will he do with it? Silly question! He will have been tremendously advertised, and that is enough.

All this may be thought fantastic, unheard-of, impossible. So it would have been twenty or even ten years ago. But, as the orators tell us, our ideals and morals have "improved" since then. Our political standards, at least, have been improved to the extent that the Hearst candidacy has now seriously to be reckoned with. The clamor of it will fill the State. Republicans are affrighted by it, and decent Democrats know not where to turn. A man who, but for his money, which he pours out lavishly in politics, would never be thought of, heading a movement which, if not financed by him, would attract but few with brains in stable equilibrium, is raiding the chief office of the State, and sober people are saying that there is no means of beating him off. This is the political portent now confronting the citizens of New York. About it they will have to think, write, speak, act for months to come.

WOMEN WAGE-EARNERS.

A movement was set on foot some months ago by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's Trade Union League, and women settlement workers to secure an investigation by the Department of Labor into the industrial conditions of women in the United States. The plan met with the approval of President Roosevelt, who recommended it to Congress, and of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, who has asked for an additional appropriation to enable the Department to carry on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

work. It ought not to be difficult to convince the committees on appropriations that such an investigation would be, merely as a basis for future legislation, amply justified. Interest in the wage-earning woman has passed the stage of curiosity and amusement. That she is now regarded as a serious element in the social as well as the industrial situation, is manifest.

Most of the ills, real and imaginary, with which society is afflicted have been, at one time or another, laid at the door of the woman wage-earner. Race suicide, the decreasing marriage rate, the increasing divorce rate, wife desertion, undermined domesticity, even the disappearance of the cook, have been, among other calamities, ascribed to the iniquitous tendency of the modern woman towards financial independence outside the home. It is a simple matter to make such charges, and under present circumstances impossible either to prove or disprove them. We have practically no data to indicate the effect, social or other, which has followed the entrance of women into industrialism.

That important changes have occurred since women took to working for wages instead of for their board, no one can doubt. It remains to be proved that society has suffered. No one but a theorizing sentimentalist ever maintained that women at any period constituted an idle class. They have, in fact, always worked. The share of women in the world's toll has probably not increased, and there is reason to doubt if it has changed radically in character. To demonstrate this theory, or else to disprove it, will be one result aimed at by the proposed inquiry.

In a recent number of the *Journal of Political Economy*, two University of Chicago women, Miss Breckenridge and Miss Abbott, publish a résumé of that part of the report of the twelfth census which deals with women engaged in gainful occupations. From these statistics it appears that more than five million women were earning money in 1900, and that the rate of increase, for the decade, of wage-earning women was much greater than the corresponding rate for the employment of men. The number of women in industry actually increased faster than the female population. The gain was not confined to the East, where immigration might be supposed to have caused it, but was marked in all sections of the country. The census scheduled 303 occupations, and women appear in 295 of them. The only occupations in which they are not found are the United States army and navy, the fire departments, and "helpers to roofers, slaters, steam boiler-makers, and brass workers." Helpers in this sense mean unskilled workers who supply physical strength. In almost all occupations women are increasing. In only four important occupations are they decreasing. It is rather amusing to find that the occupations which are becoming unpopular with women are of a character usually described as feminine—dressmakers, seamstresses, servants, and waitresses. Women dressmakers increased only 17.8 per cent. between 1890 and 1900; men dressmakers increased 150 per cent. Women milliners increased 40.5 per cent.; men milliners 340 per cent. Men appear also to be crowding women out of the saloon business, the laundries, the tailor shops, and, to a certain extent, the cotton mills. But women increased in all departments of trade and transportation 120.3 to men's 37.6 per cent. Women distanced men in all but one of the five large groups of the census classification. The exceptional group was that of domestic and personal service.

The census, however, only enumerates, and does not explain. Sometimes its figures are gravely misleading. If the statistics relating to the garment trades, for example, were accepted literally, the inquirer might receive the impression that women are dropping needles and thread and that men are snatching them as they fall. When we read that women seamstresses increased in the decade only 0.04 per cent., while men seamstresses increased 20.8 per cent., we gasp first, and afterwards wonder what was meant by the term seamstress. The census throws no light on the distinction between a seamstress, a dressmaker, and a tailor. Is the Italian woman who "sews pants" in a tenement a tailor or a seamstress? Is the girl in a fashionable shirt-waist shop a dressmaker? What is the young girl who performs simple tasks in a cloak-making factory? The census does not say.

Nor does it give any real information as to the competition between men and women in trades and professions. One is left to infer that men and women are performing substantially the same tasks, but even superficial observation of the facts disproves this hypothesis. We really do not know just how far, it at all, women have displaced men in industry; neither do we know exactly the extent of direct competition between the sexes. The subject is of great importance. The study published in the *Journal of Political Economy* rightly points out that "with it is inextricably interwoven the vital question of women's wages, and the more vital question of the nature of the work to be done by women, the dignity and permanence of their position in the industrial world, and the effect upon them of the work they do."

ASPECTS OF COMIC JOURNALISM.

The resignation of Sir Francis C. Burnand, for twenty-five years editor of London *Punch*, reminds one how little that paper has been subject to the vicissitudes of journalism. As if by foreordination, the admirable parodist, Owen Seaman, takes the head of the historic table, and *Punch* will, if anything, be more *Punch* than ever. Others may change, but *Punch* retains a kind of Olympian uniformity. From its first number, sixty-five years ago, to the last, its outward appearance and inward savor are practically identical. England has been in conspiracy to provide it with talent. During the retiring editor's term of office the paper lost such artists as Charles Keene, Du Maurier, and Sir John Tenniel; but it also saw the rise of Mr. Linley Sambourne's forceful caricature, of Mr. Raven-Hill's delightful rusticities, of the nervous and most expressive art of the lamented Phil May. In fact, barring an inclination to over-indulgence in rather trite doggerel, *Punch's* jorum has rarely been more tasty than in the past quarter-century. Its only serious rival in the comic field has been *Fliegende Blätter*.

There is, of course, the prevailing American view that *Punch* is dull. Dull it is, in the sense that the best fun of the most jocose family may be merely tantalizing to the outsider. A nudge to the initiated may be sufficient to recall jokes proved by a thousand laughs; the uninitiated needs a clue. Now, *Punch's* family is London—a family whose acquaintance is tolerably worth while; and probably no one who has not imaginatively made himself familiar with the mood of London has any business with *Punch* at all. It is the homesickness for London that extends the subscription-list to the bounds of the Empire; it is the desire to know what London thinks of itself, of the provinces, of the world, that makes readers for *Punch* in every land. It represents London in the mood of intellectual dalliance as thoroughly as *Fliegende Blätter* does non-Prussian Germany. This representative quality gives to these two comic papers something of the solemnity of institutions.

No other nation has shown the same continuity of humor. French comic journalism, which in sheer literary and artistic ability yields to none, is always prone to lapse into didactic and fairly savage satire, or into crapulous buffoonery. A genuine humorist like Gavarni or Caran d'Ache is a rare apparition; the tendency is towards the portentous caricature of Daumier or Forain. One remembers a few great names, but hardly the journals that kept them in pay. In our own country, the absence of anything like genuine comic journalism is even more striking. We deal with isolated names, and not with journalistic pedigrees. In fact, the only caricaturists that approximately measure up to the English or Continental standards are those that work for the daily press. If Mr. McCutcheon should come East, it would shift the centre of gravity of newspaper caricature; if Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Rogers should quit Herald Square for Park Row, a great deal of political satire would take the Subway with him. Throughout American comic journalism the same lack of sequence is felt. The only thing that changes not is the citation of those consecrated forms, the goat, the Irishman, the negro, the mother-in-law, the shrewish wife, the bibulous husband—"subjects of universal interest," the editor of a comic weekly once sardonically called them.

Comic journalism suffers equally among us from vulgarity and fastidiousness. If to write and draw down to the least exacting sense of humor makes a fairly negligible comic press, to follow pseudo-æsthetic and pseudo-literary ideals makes a periodical that, considered as pabulum for the comic spirit, is neither flesh, fowl, nor good red herring. In particular, the attempt at pictorial completeness works against anything like good humorous illustration. It is the day of the photograph, and frequently it seems as if the aim of illustrators was to apologize for the fact that they are not photographers, by making their drawings as photographic as possible. Now the zest of a joke lies in its brevity; and the shortest and most direct method is the best for the joke addressed to the eye. A few scratches of Keene's pencil, a scribble of Hokusai's brush point, afford an infallible hieroglyph for a laugh; and one need not ask far among artists to learn that these notes, abstract, exacting as regards thought and selection, economical as regards technical means, are yet far more valuable pictorially than what the layman calls a "finished" drawing.

The French and Germans have maintained the true tradition of caricature. The English have kept it, with the additional advantage, referring to comic journalism, of a settled social order, a common range of personal interests, and a somewhat uniform sense of humor. Because Mr. Gould of the *Westminster Gazette*, for example, takes counsel of his public, and not of the drawing-master, his caricatures have the matter in them. When he represents Mr. Chamberlain in the boat, reassuring sinking Mr. Balfour with the words, "If you shouldn't come up, Arthur, may I keep the boat?" he counts on a public versed in the chances of the river, and in its humors. The same drawing would lose half its appeal in New York or Paris. Until New York has developed a similar common fund of experience, it will hardly have comic papers of the true metal. Mr. John La Farge has somewhere described a work of art as essentially a transaction between two parties: the man who makes it and the man who sees it. The work itself is merely the occasion of a kind of understanding, a compromise, if you will, between what the artist put into it and what the layman makes out of it. This principle is doubly true of wit and humor. Their quality depends upon the quality of the audience. We have given Mark Twain his millions of readers, but we have not yet developed the public that requires its discreet weekly service of humorous comment on the week's happenings. We stand half-way between pioneer and urbane conceptions of the comic, and nothing will hasten the process more than a fairly clear idea of aims among editors and illustrators. Certainly neither the current bufoonery nor the affected artistry of the few that deal with "society," is making effectually for the gratification of the mind or even for the mere tickling of the ribs.

MAURICE AND THE WORKINGMEN'S COLLEGE.

LONDON, February 3, 1906.

In 1854 the Workingmen's College was founded by F. D. Maurice and his friends, among whom were numbered Kingsley, Ludlow, Tom Hughes, and Lowes Dickinson. On the 20th of January, 1906, the college moved from its old home in Great Ormond Street and took possession of a new, large and commodious building in another part of London, built and admirably suited for a collegiate institution which supplies to a body of workingmen an education, and also social advantages, in many ways resembling the educational and other benefits obtainable by richer men at our universities. The opening of these new buildings is not the sort of fact which is telegraphed across the Atlantic. Yet it is an event of quite possibly more permanent importance than the striking issue of a general election which may, after all, like many electoral victories or defeats, produce few results which are long remembered. In any case, the history and the fortunes of the Workingmen's College created by Maurice may, from two different points of view, be of some interest to the readers of the *Nation*.

The college is much more than a mere memorial of its founder: it is a monument which displays a side of his genius that is often forgotten. To his devoted admirers Maurice appeared the English theologian of his age. To most men of the generation among whom he exerted the greatest influence—to persons, that is to say, who flourished between 1850 and 1870—he often appeared to be something of a mystic, who, since they did not understand him, they sometimes too hastily assumed could not be understood. Many even of those who stood quite apart from the theological doctrines of which he was the earnest exponent, felt him to be a man of the highest intellectual power. "I have always thought," wrote John Mill, "that there was more intellectual power wasted in Maurice than in any other of my contemporaries. . . . The nearest parallel to him, in a moral point of view, is Coleridge, to whom, in merely intellectual power, apart from poetical genius, I think him decidedly superior." Even this critic, who found the greatest difficulty in accounting for the possession of the highest mental and moral gifts by a thinker who came to moral and religious conclusions so different from those reached by himself, felt a "deep . . . respect for Maurice's character and purposes, as well as for his great mental gifts." In truth, Maurice was one of those rare teachers whose goodness, wisdom, and disinterestedness, and unbounded zeal for the promotion of everything which was good, noble, and holy, was, so to speak, almost visible.

But while Maurice's character, as personally known to his contemporaries or as handed down to a succeeding generation by an admirable biography, possessed the untold attraction of goodness and nobility, yet many Englishmen, while fully sensible to his virtues and his charm, have always felt that he was a mystic, and have drawn the inference, for which there exists little valid justification, that mysticism means the sort of dreaminess which makes a man unpractical, and unfits him for doing much good work in this very workaday world. They imagine that the life of a theologian in whom they trace mystical tendencies must in some way or other have been, to use Mill's expression, though not exactly in the sense in which Mill employs it, "wasted." The Workingmen's College is the abiding confutation of this singularly erroneous idea. Its whole history proves that its founder possessed two rare gifts constantly lacking in men reputed to be specially endowed with hard common sense. He possessed at once the insight to perceive the real wants of the men and women among whom he lived, and also the ingenuity to devise the means by which to meet these needs. Long, indeed, before 1854, philanthropists and reformers to whom the meed of high praise should never be denied, had pressed upon the public the duty of educating the English people; but the preachers of this sound doctrine tended to identify education with the diffusion of useful knowledge, and felt with James Mill as if, from an educational point of view, "all would be gained if the whole population were taught to read, and all sorts of opinions were allowed to be addressed to them by word of mouth and in writing." Maurice, in common with many other good men, perceived that this ideal of education was inadequate, and that it did not provide, for the best of the working classes, the real benefits which, even in 1832, English universities conferred upon the most fortunate of their students—that is to say, a liberal interest in various forms of culture, and especially in literature, and also the inestimable, though hardly definable, training created in the best of our colleges by the habits and traditions of college life. He longed to give to intelligent wage-earners something like collegiate education. Many shared his desire, and this sympathy with his object gathered round him a body of zealous associates.

Maurice went, however, a step further than merely pointing to a fine ideal. He perceived the means by which this ideal might be more or less realized. He saw, as few had done, that workingmen of intelligence, when not oppressed by too severe toil, could and, as the fact has proved, would give their evenings to education. He saw, also, that an institution might be formed wherein education might be combined with common social life; that you might, in fact, create a school for work-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ingmen which was no mere mechanics' institute, but was in a true sense a real college. He further anticipated with truth that many among the best university graduates would freely labor at bestowing upon others the knowledge which they themselves had obtained at the universities, and obtained, in many cases, through the liberality of founders and benefactors. The Workingmen's College has been the practical fulfilment of Maurice's ideas. It is a college open to workingmen; it is a college where teaching takes place in the evening; it is a college which has kept before itself the constantly expanding ideal of a liberal education; it is a college where the students, many of whom have belonged to it and labored in and for it during their whole lifetime, have acquired during the last fifty years the best traditions of English university life. One fact among a hundred exemplifies the success of Maurice's experiment. The means for acquiring the new buildings which the college now occupies were supplied in part by a legacy of £5,000 or £6,000 from one who in his youth had been a student at the college, and, though his name was hardly known to most of its members, recollected through life and with gratitude the benefit conferred upon him by his collegiate education.

The college is not only a living monument to the genius of Maurice, it is also an illustration of that desire to do away with class feuds and animosities which was the best characteristic of English life during the last fifty years and more. This is a trait to which the future historian of the nineteenth century may, we trust, do justice, but it is a feature of English life which is apt to escape attention amidst the rant, the cant, and the turmoil of general elections and party conflicts. This desire for reconciliation is to be found in the reformers of every class and school. Bentham, Arnold, Cobden, Lord Shaftesbury, Maurice, and thousands of men influenced by these leaders and teachers, all desired a policy of reconciliation, though they pursued it by very different means. The earlier reformers, whether typified by Bentham or by Sydney Smith, aimed at repealing all laws and amending all institutions which were obviously unjust or demonstrably harmful to the poor. Philanthropists such as Lord Shaftesbury were prepared to go somewhat further, and, at the risk of even dangerous interference with trade, put a stop to any mode of manufacture which was injurious or was deemed injurious either to children or to women. Free trade itself, though an economic doctrine favorable to the growth of commerce, was considered by Cobden and Bright to be intimately connected, if not necessarily bound up, with justice to the poor and needy. All these men had more or less accomplished their work by 1854. Maurice and his disciples went a step beyond; they wished not only to ensure justice for workingmen, but to sympathize with and gain in return the sympathy of wage-earners. To call Maurice a Socialist is, we now know, as absurd as to call him either a heretic or, in the ordinary sense of the term, a Free-thinker; but Maurice and his friends wished to recognize what they deemed the good side of Socialism, and shared fully the passionate indignation of Socialists against any social arrangements which might seem to base the prosperity of a state upon the poverty or misery of the mass of the people. These men, though they knew it not, believed as firmly as Bentham that any society ought to exist for the happiness of the greatest number of its members; if, as may be said with truth, Maurice or Arnold substituted welfare for happiness, they assuredly failed to see that the happiness aimed at by the Utilitarians included welfare. This difference is now of little importance. The noticeable matter is the extraordinary success with which the labors of many men of different schools were crowned. Free trade removed a root of bitterness which did more than any revolutionary doctrines to set class against class. The prosperity which it induced deprived Chartism of its power, and, greatly to the benefit of the nation, delayed democratic change till it could be carried out without provoking either revolutionary or reactionary violence. To attribute anything like this widespread effect to the Christian Socialism of Maurice, of which the genuine Christianity is now much more noticeable than the very moderate Socialism, would be absurd. Yet the movement of which the College is at once the memorial and the permanent result, did much. It opened friendly communications between the wealthy classes and the wage-earners; it was a sign and a cause of a wide change; it led men to consider with fairness doctrines which even the reformers of an earlier generation had treated as heresies; it brought men of all classes nearer to one another.

'L'Étape,' a French novel which is, unlike most French novels, a sort of religious tract, describes a society for the education and enlightenment of Parisian artisans. This school bears a resemblance to the Workingmen's College. A priest who, an ardent Catholic and a fervent Liberal, believes that Catholicism is the true friend of democracy, appears at this college, if we may so call it, and tries to preach his doctrine to its students. They refuse him a hearing, meet his attempted arguments with threats of personal violence. The scene imagined by Bourget is probably drawn in too strong colors, yet the 'Vérité' of Zola, which is, in its tone and intention, the exact antithesis to 'L'Étape,' leads from one point of view to the same conclusion. From both novels we gather that the Conservative and the Liberal, the priest and the workingman, are divided from one another in France by inveterate hostility. The gulf which divides them is too wide to be passed over, yet a calm inquirer finds it difficult to believe that France can prosper unless this gulf can be bridged. However this be, the Workingmen's College is one of the many evidences of good will among different classes created by the strenuous efforts of good men during now more than fifty years. It is this good will which, as long as it lasts, is the real strength of modern England.

AN OBSERVER.

NAPOLEON VICTIM OF HIS CLAN.

PARIS, February 2, 1906.

The personality of Napoleon the Great has a curious hold on all who once become interested in it: I allude especially to the historians. Thiers gave a great part of his life to the study of the Consulate and the Empire. We have at present two historians who are devotees of Napoleon, M. Vandal, who continues the history of the rise of Napoleon in the period of the Directory, and M. Frédéric Masson; they both owe their popularity to their hero worship, and they must strike a very responsive chord in the public, as their success has not been impaired by the deplorable failure of the Second Empire, which, having begun with a *coup d'état*, ended in the loss of the provinces for France. The present generation has no desire whatever to return to the Imperial system; it has for the person of Napoleon I. a sort of poetic admiration; it has the feeling that he was an exceptional being, and that he was in reality the beginning and the end of an era.

M. Masson has just published the seventh volume of his 'Napoleon et sa Famille.' This indefatigable writer tells us that, though he has already written twenty-one volumes on his prodigious hero, he is far from having exhausted his subject; he has still several volumes to publish. He prophesies that, after he has accomplished his task, there will be still much to find and many materials for other works. His passion for his hero makes one think of a painter who is in love with a model, and is never tired of making sketches of his idol and of giving her a place in all his compositions. The new volume embraces the years extending from 1811 to 1813, during which were prepared the fatal events that marked the downfall of the most extraordinary fortune that history offers to our meditations. The date of the great disasters has not yet arrived, but these disasters are, so to speak, in germ in the general state of Europe, in the combinations of the enemies of Napoleon and of France.

The preface, or rather the "avant-propos," of the new volume is of high interest, as it propounds the general theory of M. Masson regarding the Napoleonic period. This, though it lurked in all his preceding works, had not yet found its definitive expression. In his opinion, the obstacle to Napoleon's gigantic plans of domination over Europe came not only from the great Powers themselves, and from England, whom he found directly unattackable and who subsidized the armies of the Continent, but also from the stupidity, the worthlessness, the ingratitude of his own brothers and sisters. He dreamed of surrounding the French Empire with satellites, who could move only in his orbit; his Corsican and clannish instincts inclined him to choose these satellites from among his own family and those connected therewith; but they all disappointed him; they identified themselves with the interests of the countries over which they ruled; they believed themselves to be sovereigns by divine right, they tried in every way to escape from the domination of the Emperor.

"In my volume vii.," writes M. Masson, "I consider less the action exercised by Napoleon upon his family than that exercised by it on his work. It is no longer Napoleon who raises his brothers or degrades them; it is they who make themselves the artisans of his fall. It is not he who imposes his laws on them, it is they who, consciously or unconsciously, by their errors or by their crimes, prepare his ruin. Their acts are most of them accomplished

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outside of his control, of his authority, of his will; but this is in virtue of the delegation he has granted them, of the powers he has bestowed, of the system which he has established. Thus, they are bound so closely to his conception of government that, if he is not historically responsible for many of their acts, he must bear the *chastisement for them*. The instruments which he chose and employed were bad; he made them worse by his veto or his compliance. . . . After the death of Napoleon, each of his brothers published or inspired apologetic memoirs, in which they tried to throw upon Napoleon the responsibility for their family disaster; they gave themselves certificates of intelligence, generosity, loyalty, liberalism."

M. Masson does not attempt to write the complete history of the countries which were for a while submitted to the Napoleonic rule; he has little doubt that many papers have been destroyed, and he has confined his efforts to a sort of résumé, sufficient to give a just idea of Napoleon's relations with his family. He makes his readers acquainted with the feelings and actions of Madame, Napoleon's mother, of Joseph, Louis, Lucien, Jerome, Fesch, Élise, Pauline, Caroline. Thus limited, his task was still very great.

"I have an account," he says, "of a secondary play which interweaves itself with the principal drama and of almost secondary scenes. My personages appear for some minutes in the forefront, they even influence the end; but they are nevertheless secondary, and their characters, however curious they appear to me, are never drawn in traits of beauty or of heroism."

Volume vii. begins with an account of the Council of 1811, and of the struggle between the Emperor and the Sacred College. Napoleon wished to give the universal Empire a universal Church. The negotiations with Pius VII. respecting these religious matters have lost much of their interest; but they had a very brutal end. The Pope was arrested and taken prisoner to Fontainebleau.

It may be said that the fortune of the Bonaparte family was at its height in the year 1811. M. Masson occupies himself first with Pauline, who had followed Madame to Aix-la-Chapelle. He describes her society, her intimacy with Montrond, with Canonville, her amusements; he speaks of her extravagance. King Jerome, in Westphalia, acquired neither consideration nor authority. His army, his kingdom, were really given up to Davout, who disposed at his pleasure of the Hanoverian battalions. The funds in the Treasury "are as much my property," wrote Napoleon to his brother, "as what I may have in the Bank of France." Jerome was not unintelligent; he understood what dangers threatened the Napoleonic domination, with such a system of tyranny. Jerome was anxious to play his part in a great war; he considered "that Westphalia was lost to him, and placed all his hopes in his army and in the command he might obtain in it."

Louis was ill and hypochondriacal. He left Holland without renouncing his throne, his people—what he called his country. He complained constantly of Napoleon, who not only had robbed him of the crown, but had poisoned his life. "I have," he writes to Lucien, "been maltreated, from my youth, by my brother." Napoleon first forced a crown on him, and then an abdication; he already had forced a wife on him. Louis is a victim; he writes volumes on his misfortunes, from Grätz, where he was living at the time, under the name of Count de Saint-Leu. He writes a poem, "Marie, ou les Peines de l'Amour," and is more occupied with his mediocre verses than with anything else.

Shall we follow Hortense in her journeys, in her villeggiaturas? Lucien's movements offer greater interest. He arrived in England at the end of 1810. He writes: "The tyrant has made a mistake. It gratifies me that, notwithstanding his desire to disgrace her [his wife Alexandrine], the news of the reception which is given us here will come to his ears, and that the image of your mother [he was writing to his children] received by the noble English of this island will pursue him and irritate him in the midst of his imperial feasts." Lucien and his wife went to Ludlow, where Lord Powis offered them the hospitality of *Dinham House. Soon afterwards, Lucien* bought for £9,000 sterling an estate near Worcester and Ludlow. He also began work on a poem, "Charlemagne." His wife writes secretly a poem on "Bathilde, Reine des Francs."

It is rather fatiguing to attend M. Masson in his excursions from one member of the Imperial family to another; he takes us from Lucien to Élise, to Caroline, to Murat, to Joseph, observing only a chronological, not a logical order. The details about Murat are among the most interesting portions. M. Masson judges him well, and renders full justice to his courage:

"Murat is the most admirable soldier, the most astonishing leader, the cavalry officer who on the battlefield has the clearest view and the promptest action, a form of boldness which belongs only to him, a *désinvolture* in the presence of death which makes it of little account to those who follow him. . . . As long as he takes the aggressive, he is unique; on the defensive, he is flat, loses his power, gets discouraged; against misfortune he opposes neither resistance nor tenacity."

During the Russian campaign, the Emperor confides to him four *corps d'armée*, twelve divisions, thirty-six thousand horse, the most astonishing mass of cavalry that has been seen in modern warfare; he leads it very badly. He says to an officer sent him by the Emperor: "Tell the Emperor that I have conducted the vanguard of the French army further than Moscow; but I am bored, you understand? I am bored. I want to go to Naples to occupy myself with my subjects." His subjects? Truly he had made himself popular in Naples, with the lazzaroni by his theatrical ways; but would he have been if he had not been chosen and supported by Napoleon? It was the fundamental error of Murat, of his wife Caroline, of Joseph in Spain, to believe in their independence; they were all nothing, if not the vassals of Napoleon. It was Napoleon's mistake to take such instruments for his gigantic projects; he could not say, "Uno avulso, non deficit alter"; he made choice only in his own clan, and the most intelligent member of his family, Lucien, had become his bitter enemy.

Correspondence.

THE LATE KING OF DENMARK.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the number of your highly esteemed paper for February 1st I ran across the following lines:

"Few monarchs have been more sorely tried than King Christian. Early in his reign the Danish Duchies were torn from his kingdom by Germany, and England permitted the spoliation with a supineness that aroused Mr. Robert Cecil (later Lord Salisbury) to his highest flights of satire."

By the Danish Duchies you understand the Duchies of Holstein and Schleswig.

Permit me to suggest some remarks, the correctness of which may be easily ascertained.

(1.) The Duchy of Holstein is, and has always been, more thoroughly German than any other part or portion of Germany since the times of Hengist and Horsa of mythical fame. It has never been a part of Denmark. Under the Holy Roman Empire it was part of the Lower Saxon Circle or District; it was also included in the German Confederation established at the Congress of Vienna. It was connected with Denmark precisely in the same way as Hanover was with Great Britain. From George I. to the death of William IV. the electors and kings of Hanover were kings of Great Britain. From Christian I. till the death of Frederik VII., the Dukes of Schleswig-Holstein were kings of Denmark. As in England Queen Victoria succeeded to the throne under the laws of England, while under the Salic law prevailing in Germany the Duke of Cumberland ascended the throne of Hanover, so on the death of Frederik VII. Christian IX. succeeded to the throne of Denmark, while Duke Frederik of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg was called to the throne of Holstein and Schleswig under the laws of Germany prevailing in those old German provinces. The fact that Duke Frederik of Augustenburg (father to the present Empress) was euchred out by Bismarck, has nothing to do with this case.

(2.) The first King of Denmark of the Oldenburg line, Christian I. of Oldenburg, was also elected Duke by the estates of Holstein and Schleswig on condition that those two countries should remain united forever (*up ewig ungedeelt*). This fundamental law was broken in 1846 by Christian VIII. of Denmark, who, under coercion of the mob of Copenhagen, issued an open letter, in which he declared his intention to extend the law of succession in Denmark to his German Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. For an answer, the estates of Holstein and Schleswig set up a provisional government of their own and took up arms in defence of their rights. They were defeated in the battle of Idstedt and turned over to the good graces of Denmark by the German Confederation. Schleswig was incorporated into Denmark by another *coup d'état* in 1863. Then followed the war of 1864, which settled the Danish claims for good.

(3.) That Great Britain was very anxious to prevent the establishment of an independent German state at the mouth of the river Elbe, and was even more opposed to the annexation of Schleswig and Holstein by Prussia, is well known. War was avoided only by the obstinate opposition of the Queen. The details are interestingly related in the Memoirs of the Earl of Malmesbury.

(4.) The high flights of satire on the part of Mr. Robert Cecil, later Lord Salisbury, show conclusively how little even better informed English statesmen of his period

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cared for truth and fair play outside of their own national affairs. Nor did his sneering remarks, that the Germans had better save the Baltic provinces from Russian oppression, reflect much credit on his common sense. Courland and Livonia, though partly colonized by Germans some 800 years ago, have never been part of Germany; 90 per cent. of their inhabitants are of Slavic stock, while Holstein has always belonged to Germany and is inhabited only by Germans, and Schleswig at least by an overwhelming majority of the German race. As even divine Homer was sometimes caught napping, so we may assume that Mr Robert Cecil was half-asleep when he committed these uncommonly silly remarks to his diary.

(5.) The late King Christian IX. was not a member of the royal house of Denmark by birth, nor was he a Dane by blood or born in Denmark. He simply was one of the many German princelings without patrimony or expectations. His wife was a niece of King Christian VIII.; and since no heirs were born to Christian VIII. and Frederik VII., her husband of the Glücksburg line was designated to the throne of Denmark, after the late Grand Duke Peter of Oldenburg had politely refused to accept the honor. Neither the Queen of England nor the Empress Dowager of Russia was born a princess of Denmark; but fortunately very few people knew about it. Many of the troubles of King Christian IX. during the first years of his reign were caused by the fact that the most zealous Danes (mostly of the city of Copenhagen) were distrustful and opposed to him on account of his German birth.

Trusting that you will find these objections historically correct, I remain, with great respect, your faithful reader,

DR. E. SCHRADER.

1311 Sprague Avenue, Spokane, Wash., February 9, 1906.

NIETZSCHE'S WORKS IN ENGLISH.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Our attention has been called to an editorial on "The Function of an Endowed Press" in a recent edition of the *Nation*, in the course of which the writer adverts to the incident of the appearance of two volumes of Nietzsche's works produced by a London publisher. The late firm of Henry & Co. brought out two volumes of Nietzsche, and these were later taken over by Unwin, who brought out the third and fourth. In this country we publish these four volumes of translations of Nietzsche's works: 'Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book of All and None,' 'A Genealogy of Morals,' 'The Case of Wagner, the Twilight Idols, Nietzsche contra Wagner,' 'The Dawn of Day.' It occurs to us that the writer of the editorial in question may perhaps be interested to know this; and if he and his friends will support us by buying the third and fourth volumes, we should be perhaps encouraged to go on.

Seriously, however, the point seems to be that enterprises of this kind to which the writer of the article in the *Nation* refers are undertaken from time to time; and that when they drop from the hands of one publisher they are apt to be taken up by another. Without going into particular instances, we think it may be said that a great deal of serious literature, including serious current literature, is published both here and in England at prices similar to those which are charged for current fiction. And while, of course, it is true that fiction has come to occupy a more prominent place in the public eye and on the book counters than serious literature, so that your editorial writer is entirely justified in suggesting that fiction and serious literature do not appear side by side and on equal terms, yet we have reason to know that the amount of serious literature which is bought and read throughout this country is entirely disproportionate to the amount of attention which its circulation attracts. We would venture to submit that the devotion of the American reading public to fiction, to the exclusion of more serious books, does not obtain to the extent which appearances would seem to indicate.—Very truly yours.

For the Macmillan Company.

HERBERT P. WILLIAMS.

New York, February 19, 1906.

THE "MEDUSA" OF THE UFFIZI GALLERY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: M. Corrado Ricci, the eminent director of the Florentine galleries, made an interesting announcement recently in the *Istituto Germanico* of Rome, which was reprinted in the *Marzocco* of Florence for December 17, 1905. It concerns the famous head of "Medusa" in the Uffizi Gallery, hitherto attributed to Leonardo da Vinci. M. Ricci observes that the spreading of error is generally more rapid and becomes more deeply rooted than that of truth. As a case in point, the splendid picture by Titian in the Borghese Gallery in Rome, representing "Venus and Medea," is still called in catalogues, photographs, and even in histories of art, by its false title of "Sacred and Profane Love." The so-called "Beatrice Cenci" in the Barberini Gallery is generally attributed to Guido Reni. Though it is proved that Reni did not come to Rome until several years after the beheading of the renowned Roman parricide, the legend of his painting the beautiful girl a few days before her death is too popular to be easily uprooted. Yet the canvas surely represents a Sibyl.

The authenticity of this "Medusa" of Leonardo had been already doubted. But an allusion of Vasari's and the persistent force of error have thus far carried more weight than technical, historical, or æsthetic opinions. Vasari speaks ('Vite,' iv., p. 32, Florence, 1879) of a hideous beast which Leonardo painted on the cross-section of a fig tree for a countryman, while our painting is square and painted on Dutch oak. That alone is sufficient proof that this is not the Florentine "Medusa" of which Vasari speaks. He writes also of another "Medusa" begun by Leonardo, but which remained unfinished, while that of the Uffizi is complete in detail and design. So neither of these two mentioned by Vasari can be identified with the Uffizi picture, and we can only conclude that all trace of them is lost.

But M. Ricci has found a very satisfactory solution to this vexed question: In an inventory of the "guardaroba ducale" of the end of the sixteenth or the beginning of the following century, one reads that the head of a Medusa "was presented to S. E. by the page of M. Philippe de Viq., etc. In a catalogue of 1769 the same picture is put down as a "Medusa in the Flemish manner." It is only in the following catalogue (1784) that for the first time the picture appears attributed to Leonardo da Vinci. From that date on, error flourishes, and we always find the picture appearing among Leonardo's works.

Even if these documents were not convincing enough, Italian artists always represented the Medusa full-face, while in the Uffizi picture the head is horizontal and in profile; all the hideous animals, so realistic, so carefully finished, reveal Northern ideas and treatment, and convince us that this head of Medusa in the Uffizi Gallery could never have come from the brush that gave us "la Gioconda."

UMBERTO GNOLI.

Pisa, February 2, 1906.

Notes.

The second series of "Ancient Records," whose publication has been undertaken by the University of Chicago, is now issuing from its Press, viz., 'Ancient Records in Egypt,' by Prof. James H. Breasted of the University. It is first of the three contemplated, and the present volume is one of four to appear at intervals before July. An index will probably be supplied. Prof. Robert F. Harper's 'Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia,' and the late President Harper's 'Ancient Records of Palestine,' are still somewhat indeterminate.

The well-known articles on American history contributed by Alexander Johnston to Lalor's 'Cyclopædia of Political Science' have been arranged by Prof. James A. Woodburn of Indiana University in the form of a continuous narrative, under the title of 'American Political History, 1763-1876' (2 vols., Putnams). Of the worth of the articles themselves there is, of course, no question, and the work of the editor seems to have been, on the whole, skilfully performed. It is a pity, however, if the job was to be done at all, that some of the details should not have been more carefully attended to. A reasonable modification of phraseology, particularly in the opening sentences of articles, for the sake of better connection, could not have been objected to by the most exacting critic; but Professor Woodburn apparently has felt bound to follow his author literally, even when to do so produces such extraordinary results as those on pages 408-411 of volume two, where West Virginia bursts upon the scene. The numerous cross-references of the originals are here transferred bodily to footnotes, where, of course, they are both inappropriate and misleading, since the topics to which they refer can be found only by consulting the index. The original bibliographies, too, excellent in their day, ought certainly to have been revised and brought up to date, instead of being left for the most part twenty years behindhand; it is strange, for example, to find a list of authorities on the Bank controversy without a mention of Catterall's definitive work, or on the distribution of the surplus revenue without notice of E. G. Bourne's authoritative treatise. The statement (vol. i., p. 391)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that "there is no good history of the finances of the country in the English language" makes one wonder what Professor Woodburn thinks of Prof. Davis R. Dewey's volume. We note some avoidable misprints: Ferrand for Farrand (vol. i., p. 82), McDonald for MacDonald (vol. i., p. 269), and a double entry of Burgess's 'Reconstruction and the Constitution' (vol. ii., p. 478). The usefulness of the book in its present form will doubtless be considerable, and almost anything that will insure a wider acquaintance with Johnston's articles should be welcomed; but a separate collection of the articles in their original arrangement, with necessary revision and addition, is still, we think, a desideratum.

We had hoped to dilate upon the Atlas volume concluding Dr. Thwaites's grand publication of Lewis and Clark's original Journals (Dodd, Mead & Co.); but we perceive that we must give it up. It embraces the explorers' maps, almost wholly the skilful work of Clark, with some others carried out by the expedition, and with a general map of the entire route indicated on present-day political geography. There remains but one field of devotion for Lewis and Clark antiquaries, and that is a plotting of Clark's maps *at scale* on the maps of to-day. But it may be yet too early to do this, speaking cartographically.

Under the title of 'The Chief American Poets,' Curtis Hidden Page has edited for class use about six hundred and fifty pages of selections from Bryant, Poe, Emerson, Longfellow, Whittier, Holmes, Lowell, Whitman, and Lanier, with brief biographical sketches and copious reference to material for further study (Houghton, Mifflin & Co.). The declared aim has been to select the best from each author, representing, of course, the various phases of his work, and we find no glaring lapses of judgment to record, either of exclusion or of inclusion. As to Lowell, we raise the question whether critics and biographers are right in their total neglect of a poem which the author himself, shortly after its publication, referred to in a private letter as the best thing he had yet done. We refer to "The Fountain of Youth," of which Lowell's closest friend among the honored names of literary New England has been heard to say in recent years that it sprang from the deepest currents of the author's life.

Dr. Reginald R. Sharpe, Record Clerk in the City of London's Town Clerk's office, has issued, in his 'Calendars of Letter-Books' of the Corporation, a transcript of the so-called Letter-Book G, of which the date runs from 1352 to 1374. The reign is Edward the Third's, in which France and England were intermittently at war, with mutual invasions. The terminal year is that of Petrarch's death; and amid all the curious information, historical and customary, to be found in this volume and helpfully summarized in Dr. Sharpe's introduction, two items have a surpassing literary interest, remotely associated with the great Italian. One is the mention of John Chaucer, possibly the poet's father, as one of the ward collectors of a naval tax imposed on the city by the King; while the poet himself appears in the record of a lease to him of a tenement over Aldgate precisely in 1374. These items are not now first discovered or published, however. Nor is it new that the guilds, prototypes of our trade-unions, were in this period effectively directing that "no one, for instance, could follow the trade of fishmonger unless he became a member of the Guild, whilst no member of the Guild was allowed to meddle in any other trade." To this after six centuries have we reverted!

Halifax is a town in Plymouth County, Mass., which has never had more than 800 inhabitants, since 1875 has but once surpassed the population of 1765 (556), and last year sank to 497. By means of an "Old Colony Town Record Fund," the vigorous Massachusetts Society of *Mayflower* Descendants in Boston has just published the town's 'Vital Records' to the end of the year 1849, transcribed from five different volumes. For Barnstable County, using its special Fund, the Society has already published the 'Vital Records of Brewster.' The volumes are neat in appearance, and have been compiled with scrupulous painstaking. The proceeds of publication go to swell the respective Funds.

Whatever else it may be, Professor Nino Tamassia's latest book on 'S. Francesco d'Assisi e la sua Leggenda' (Padua: Fratelli Drucker) is altogether worthy of his deservedly high reputation for scholarship and research, while the subject chosen is such as to appeal to a far larger circle of readers than has been the case with any of his previous works. Indeed, the volume before us is one which no serious student of St. Francis and his times can afford to neglect. The thesis is revolutionary; but it is supported by a wealth of evidence which, if only by reason of its cumulative quality, acquires tremendous cogency and force. That the earliest and most authoritative histories of the Saint, from the 'Vita' of Tomaso da Celano to the 'Floretti,' are nothing but a *réchauffé* of still earlier myths; that the genesis of the legend of the Stigmata is neither miraculous nor pathological, but literary, being, in fact, traceable to the ἐγὼ γὰρ τὰ στίγματα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματί μου βαστάζω of St. Paul; and that the wolf of Agobbio never really existed except in a symbolic sense, are a few among the many subversive opinions which are more or less openly maintained in these pages. Even M. Sabatier is vigorously assailed, and the whole story of St. Francis is cast into the melting-pot of ruthless critical analysis. Such a book may outrage our prejudices and run counter to all our preconceived notions; but it certainly cannot be ignored.

The *Library Journal* for January contains an article on "Special Libraries," by Mr. Robert H. Whitten of the State Library in Albany, describing the method of keeping extracts and clippings from periodicals in the Legislative Reading-Room at that library. Articles from some 500 engineering, medical, law, and general periodicals are extracted bodily, placed in manila envelopes, and filed in a classified arrangement with other pamphlets and manuscripts. Mr. Whitten argues that this method has decided advantages over the old method of cataloguing or indexing, which compels the inquirer to spend considerable time first in finding the references he wants, and then in waiting for the attendant to collect all the volumes he would consult, while "under the system under discussion he goes to the vertical file, picks out a handful of articles on the subject, selects the one or two desired, the whole operation occupying only a few minutes."

The January number of the *Printing Art* opens with an essay from the pen of Prof. Charles Eliot Norton, illustrated with several facsimiles, on the new so-called Humanistic type introduced by the University Press at Cambridge, Mass. This type is an attempt to revert, not to the early printers, but to *their* models, the scribes. Another article in the same number, by Mr. John Cotton Dana, deals with Library Printing, viz., of cards, bulletins, announcements, and that sort of thing. Mr. Dana shows, by a well-chosen selection of illustrations, how dignity and beauty can be obtained by the simplest means, by types accessible to the smallest printing-offices. The lesson is needed. Mr. Dana holds that libraries should "coöperate and even be leaders in the present forward movement in the industrial arts," and points out how they are able to bring lessons in beauty home to their readers through the printed matter which they distribute freely.

A list of over five hundred English standard works on Philosophy, compiled by Benjamin Rand, is given in the February Bulletin of the Boston Public Library. It consists of the leading histories and the works of and commentaries upon seventy-one philosophers. A noteworthy fact is that the largest number of titles is under Herbert Spencer, who is followed hard by Immanuel Kant. Current prices are annexed to most of the works in the list.

The *Annales de Géographie* for January opens with a discussion of the relations of the structure of the earth's crust to earthquakes. Observations of more than 170,000 show that they occur almost equally and exclusively along two narrow zones lying on two great circles of the terrestrial sphere: the Mediterranean or Alpine-Caucasian-Himálayan circle, with 53 per cent. of recorded earthquakes; and the circum-Pacific or Andeo-Japanese, Malaysian circle, with 41 per cent. These observations, it is asserted, give no support to the theory that the tetrahedral distortion of the earth's crust is due to this cause. Other articles are a summary of the facts, with a map, brought out by the first Russian census of 1897, in regard to the distribution of races and languages in the Empire; accounts of the cartography of French Indo-China, of the Kalahari desert in South Africa, and of the geology and glacial phenomena of the region of Jacobshavn, Greenland. Among the minor contents is a notice of a so-called French military mission for the purpose of discovering the best route from the Peruvian coast to the Amazon, and the progress of the rubber plantations throughout the world, but especially in the East. M. de Martonne describes the first inter-university geographical excursion. Students from eight French universities, under the direction of the professor of geography at Rennes, last summer studied the physical geography of Brittany. Languedoc will be visited by this year's excursion.

The *Globus* reports the details of a new German oceanographic expedition recently

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sent out by the Naval Department of the German Government, the work to be carried on on the "Vermessungsschiff" *Planet*, a steamer of 650 tons. The vessel is to proceed northward of the Philippines to the Bismarck Archipelago, and, in addition to deep-sea measurements, the meteorology of those regions will be studied, especially the conditions of the higher strata by means of balloons. With a view to studying the coast outlines, stereophotogrammetry is to be utilized on a larger scale than ever before, and the same means will also be employed for the study of the size and shape of ocean waves. It has been decided that the *Planet* shall remain for a number of years thus employed in the western tropical regions of the Pacific Ocean.

The statistics of the census for 1905 are being gradually published by the German authorities. According to these reports, there are now forty-one "Grossstädte," *i. e.*, cities of more than one hundred thousand inhabitants in the Empire. This is eight in excess of the number in 1900, when the last census was taken. There are now five cities with over half a million inhabitants, as compared with two half a decade ago. These are Berlin, reporting 2,034,000 inhabitants; Hamburg, with 800,882; Munich, with 538,393; Dresden, with 514,283; and Leipzig, with 502,570. The most extraordinary growth is reported by Duisberg, which in the past five years advanced from 93,605 to 191,551, and Gelsenkirchen, which jumped from 40,500 to 146,742.

The Institute for Austrian History has begun the publication of a series of works that promise to be of exceptional value for the study of illuminated manuscripts. With the financial support of the Imperial Cultus Ministerium, successive catalogues are being issued to furnish scientifically accurate and illustrated accounts of the rich treasures of illuminated miniatures found in such abundance in the libraries of the Austrian Empire. The two opening volumes have made their appearance, the first being devoted to the Tyrol, and containing descriptions of 275 illuminated documents found in twenty-six libraries, cloisters, and museums; the second, entitled "Salzburg," contains an illustrated description of 126 such manuscripts, a goodly number being unique. Of special interest are the productions of the Salzburg schools of the eleventh, twelfth, and fifteenth centuries. Notwithstanding the fact that the Salzburg libraries were despoiled in favor of the libraries of Paris, Munich, and Vienna, an abundance of good material in this vein remains. Prof. Franz Wickhoff, who holds the chair of the history of art in the University of Vienna, is the general editor of the whole series, but each volume is being prepared by some specialist who is also a member of the Institute. Other volumes are to follow, covering the various provinces of the Empire. A special volume will treat of the manuscripts in the possession of the Imperial family.

Our London correspondent describes on another page the Workingmen's College founded by Frederick Maurice, apropos of its occupation of a new domicile, after patient waiting. We understand that, as is usual in such cases, the improved condition will involve a larger annual outlay for maintenance of building and of the staff of instructors. From thirty to fifty thousand dollars could be usefully added to the endowment, and some part of this may well come from Maurice's admirers in this country, or from sympathizers with his philanthropic foundation. Any such may send their offerings to the principal of the college, Prof. A. V. Dicey, 80 Banbury Road, Oxford.

A Paris reader writes: "An advertisement in your columns concerning the new monthly of the University of Chicago, the *Journal of Political Economy*, names among its board of advisory editors M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, who is stated to be a Senator. But he is not a member of the upper house, though he has more than once tried to be elected to the Chamber of Deputies; nor is either his brother or his son in Parliament. He is, however, a member of the Institute and a professor of the College of France—titles of the highest honor here."

—The symposium on "The Municipal Librarian's Aims in Bookbuying," in the *Library* for January, brings up again the moot question whether the function of libraries is strictly educational or essentially entertaining. An anonymous "Municipal Librarian" states very forcibly "The Educational Ideal: The Best and the Best Only"; while the editor's "Plea for Elasticity" presents the argument for the other side. These two articles were sent to a number of prominent librarians and literary men, in order to elicit expressions of opinion. Some of the replies are of unusual interest. Mr. Sidney Lee does not think "that public funds ought to be applied to the provision of such frivolous amusement as ephemeral fiction affords. . . . Municipal libraries constitute in my mind," he says, "a public danger if those who choose the books for them are content to echo the voice of the majority, or deem themselves under obligation to satisfy the demands of prevailing ignorance rather than to seek to counteract or diminish it." Mr. Sidney Webb, on the other hand, asks: "Why should not the citizens collectively provide themselves with recreative or amusing literature, if they choose, at whatever level of taste or culture they may have attained?" He does not think the question very important, but raises the more pertinent question "whether the librarians and members of library committees are doing all they can to make their institutions as useful to the community as possible." And he mentions, among the matters which library authorities might consider, the formation of local collections, and the selection of some one subject for each library to specialize on.

—Mr. H. W. Singer's 'Whistler,' in the Langham Series of Art Monographs (Scribner's), is a rather inconsequent little book, for which not a great deal in praise is to be said. The first twenty of the eighty pages of text are devoted to a discussion of Whistler's personality and his gentle art of making enemies—surely a liberal proportion—while six more pages, in the middle, are devoted to the hardly needed defence of art critics and to the exposition of Mr. Singer's own view that "the less the critic himself has painted or carved, the better it will be for him." He considers the fact that both Ruskin and "'Arry" Quilter were painters, a sufficient proof of the falsity of Whistler's (and Dürer's) doctrine that "none but an artist can be a competent critic." He hardly perceives the bearing on his own dictum of the fact that Whistler's writings seem to him worthy of discussion at length as "part of the gospel of the newer art criticism," and as the work of "a prophet of æsthetics" and "a divinely inspired oracle." His attitude is oddly compounded of personal antagonism and convinced Whistlerianism; but of any real analysis of the nature of Whistler's art he is incapable. "It is owing to the purely artistic character of these creations," he remarks, "that so little is to be said about them," and he has certainly found little to say. The only descriptive passages of importance are long quotations from Geffroy and Duret. Finally, the seeker of light on the real qualities of Whistler will get as little from the illustrations as from the text. With one or two exceptions, they are not well chosen, and, almost without exception, they are abominably reproduced.

—Under the general title "Epochs of Irish History," the firm of David Nutt is publishing a series of little books by Miss Eleanor Hull of which two volumes, 'Pagan Ireland' and 'Early Christian Ireland,' have already appeared. They are dedicated to the young students of Irish in a London branch of the Gaelic League, and are obviously intended for similar classes of readers. The style is therefore simple and popular—sometimes almost too condescendingly simple; yet the footnotes and occasional digressions bear testimony to the author's scholarly interests and particularly to her knowledge of folklore. The books contain a variety of information about ancient Ireland, the country and the archæological remains, the manners, customs, and beliefs of the people, and a sketch of their history. In these early periods the history is largely legendary, and Miss Hull has simply told the old stories as they were preserved in the native authors. Her selection of tales is good, and she has made use of the best modern editions and translations. She has also brought together a great deal of material which could not be found elsewhere, except in expensive works like Dr. Joyce's 'Social History of Ireland,' or O'Curry's 'Manners and Customs.' In general, the books seem to us well adapted to their purpose. Naturally one does not look in them for scholarly analysis of the old documents or for much discussion of their significance; and when the author does venture on such critical comment, it is usually not of much value. The question of accuracy in translation does not ordinarily arise, since Miss Hull is chiefly occupied with free summaries of the texts with which she deals; but it may be worth while to suggest one correction of this nature. The opening words of the Irish hymn ascribed to St. Patrick, should probably be rendered "I arise," and not "I bind myself."

—Many a reader of Dunlop's 'History of Fiction,' who has kept some small Latin from his college days, has doubtless wished for a first-hand acquaintance with that fund of mediæval story and fable which has given so much to French and Italian literature as well as to our own Chaucer. Such an acquaintance has heretofore de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manded a university library, with time to browse therein. Prof. Jakob Ulrich has now sought to give, in small compass, specimens of the best of this mediæval fiction, 'Proben der lateinischen Novellistik des Mittelalters, ausgewählt und mit Anmerkungen versehen,' Leipzig, 1906. The editor has wisely refrained—a rare virtue in a German editor—from overloading his book with historical and critical notes, and of the 217 pages 208 are given up to the Latin text. He has thus been able to supply a surprisingly large amount of material. The collection opens with twenty-two pages of selections in verse, among which are included the "Snow Child," one of the three beast poems ascribed to Paulus Diaconus, the "Unibos," and eight out of the ten stories of woman's trickery by Adolphus of Vienna, one of which we find in elaborated form in Chaucer's "Merchant's Tale" of January and May. Of prose we have twenty-two stories from the 'Disciplina Clericalis' of the Spanish Jew, Petrus Alphonsus, which is the first example in Western literature of the Oriental story-within-a-story, and of which there exists a Norman version as early as the twelfth century. This is followed by twenty-two selections from John of Capua's translation of the 'Kalilah and Dimnah,' the introduction, which gives the framework, and eight stories from 'The Seven Wise Masters,' five from Dolopathos, forty-one from the 'Gesta Romanorum,' thirty-seven from the 'Exempla' of Jacques de Vitry, forty-three from Étienne de Bourbon, and some six pages from the Tours collection. The notes are unpretentious, consisting chiefly of references to Gröber's sketch of Middle Latin literature in his 'Grundriss,' to Benfey's 'Pantschatantra' and to the works of Dunlop, Clouston, Chauvin, Köhler, etc. Here and there we find a short indication of the later life of a story in modern European literature in a reference to Boccaccio, LaFontaine or Grimm. The book offers interesting examples of mediæval Latin style as well as of the genealogy of fiction. Moreover, these short-stories from the long ago—how long ago it were rash to say—will still prove amusing reading for one who reads his Latin with feet on the fender.

ALFRED RUSSEL WALLACE.

My Life: A Record of Events and Opinions. By Alfred Russel Wallace. Dodd, Mead & Co. 1905. 2 vols. 8vo, pp. 435, 464.

One of the scientific notables of the past forty-five years, a man to whom Darwin could write (and in substance often did), "I wish I had your power of arguing clearly" (vol. ii., p. 11), and that in reference to the very theory which his own radiant argument had illumined, must evidently be a spirit of no ordinary force; and his opinions, of which he has set forth a greater number than most scientific men find time to mature, make a more curious collection than all the rare birds and butterflies he sent home from the islands of the East, the famous Semioptera with its *panache* included. He believes in paper money as a standard of value, in national ownership of all the land, in Socialism, seemingly in astrology (ii., 335, *bis*), and unquestionably in full-blown spiritualism. If we are not mistaken, he is opposed to vivisection, as he emphatically is to vaccination, enforced or voluntary, to interest on money, to all inheritance and testamentary disposition of property. He scorns as utterly uncritical the modern scientific determinations of centres of psychical function in the cortex of the brain—not merely the work of Flourens, but also the later attempts of Broca, Munk, and others; and in this he is not so very far from the general opinion of students of the subject, who have at the most yielded but a hesitant and provisional assent to any one attempt to characterize the distinctive functions of the different regions of the brain. On the other hand, he warmly espouses the old phrenology of Gall and the bumps of the travelling lecturers of the forties. These paradoxes are defended by him with all the conviction of his reason, and more. He believes in all that he believes down to the very soles of his boots; and his arguments are mostly so surprisingly strong that some one of his works, say his 'Studies, Scientific and Social,' ought to be made the basis of a course of lectures on logic. Happy would be the university which should find itself equipped with a professor of logic really capable of dealing with his text.

As to Darwin's encomium, it does not stand alone. John Stuart Mill, Herbert Spencer, Sir Norman Lockyer, Huxley, John Fiske, Chauncey Wright—in short, almost everybody whose judgment concerning the logic of science had any particular value—have ranked Wallace among the past masters in scientific argumentation; yet his narrow training has rendered him an easy mark for whatsoever evil spirit there may be, personal or not, that beguiles men into sophistries, confusions, and rash assumptions, and it perhaps goes far to explain his willingness to serve as an instructor of the public on original lines in such a vast curriculum of subjects. He tells us (ii., 39) that he has "a positive distaste for all forms of anatomical and physiological experiment," and that he never even *saw* a dissection; nevertheless, biologists attach great weight to his conclusions about the distribution of animals, the classification of the races of mankind, etc. He has to have translations made for him from the German—and Malay, which he speaks fluently, will hardly be reckoned as an equivalent; but many a naturalist of good sense would doubtless be glad if he could exchange all his knowledge of German for half of Wallace's acumen in balancing scientific evidences. Wallace is an Oxford D.C.L., as well as an LL.D.; in this exceptional case the degree of D.C.L. really effected something, namely, it showed experimentally that, for all his paradoxes, even a university which is above all else *orthodox*, which would shiver at the bare idea of being *paradox*, or so much as paraclit to paradoxy, perceived that to "honor" Wallace in show would be to honor herself in deed. Bearing all these things in mind, and knowing well that Wallace never wrote a dull line in his life, and couldn't if he tried, his very tables and diagrams being as entertaining as they are valuably instructive, our reviewer, we will answer for him, was not a little curious to read this autobiography and to discover what schooling of child and man had produced this conglomerate personality.

In 1823, George IV. being King of England, Louis XVIII. of France, on the eighth day of the year, Alfred Russel Wallace was born two miles from the north bank of the Severn, at Usk, on the river Usk. He was named after a Mr. Richard Russell, and we learn that the reason why he always spells his middle name with one *l* is that, after the christening, the parish clerk, who was no great speller, so wrote it in the register! No more inexplicable case of "psychic influence"—and it has lasted for eighty-three years—is told of in the spiritualistic chapter, although Home and Stainton Moses figure there. He came of virtuous Church-of-England middle-class stock, not at all sordid or vulgar. His father, having a competency at first, did not practise his profession of attorney, and, by his ignorance of law and business, gradually sank into extreme poverty. When Alfred was about six, the family moved to Hertford, and, after a year or two of teaching by his father, he went to the public grammar school, where he learned nothing but the nomenclature of geography, chiefly of English towns, and above all the Latin grammar; and this is the only schooling (in the narrow sense) that he ever had. The vestiges of some knowledge of Latin still appear, now and then, in his sentences, especially in constructions that are bad in a language in which the order of succession of the words is the only clue,* as well as in the frequency of "I and brother William," "I and my wife," "I and Mr. Mitten" (vol. i., pp. 246, 247, 251, 337, 339; ii., 49, 61, 238), though in the accusative it is "my brother and me" (i., 256). More than once in this book he deplores an incapacity for language which he attributes to himself. But, as to this, it is necessary to distinguish between a natural incapacity and early want of facility due to one's self-communions not having been such as to exercise one's faculty. We take leave to doubt any lack in him of the faculty itself, for the few facts at our disposal rather point the other way. Thus, his description of his school life shows that he was anything but industrious; yet he gained enough Latin to pick out the sense of the Æneid, and no doubt to parse the sentences. Later he found it "very easy" to learn Malay; and although that language is, as he says, of the simplest construction, especially the dialect of Sumatra, with which he presumably began, yet it may be doubted whether any grown man whose capacity for language was decidedly defective would have been so particularly struck with the facility of the task of learning it. So, during his sojourn in Wales, he greatly enjoyed the Welsh church services; he enlarges upon the beauty of this ancient tongue, which is quite noticeable for its various modifications of its words, and he praises the elocution of the preacher in a way that implies that he followed the speech, word for word, though it was only a Sunday recreation for him. But the evidence we most rely upon is his own remarkably lucid, easy, and harmonious style of writing; remarkable, we mean, in comparison with that of others who, like him, have never received any instruction in rhetoric. With little opportunity to compare his own

*For example: "Before leaving Singapore I wrote a long letter to my old fellow-traveller and companion, Henry Walter Bates, then collecting on the upper Amazon, almost wholly devoted to entomology and especially giving my impressions of the comparative richness of the two countries." This is far from being one of Wallace's worst sentences; but it illustrates the Latinity (i. 349).

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

performances with those of other unpractised writers, he would at first naturally judge of his own talent by the effort it cost him to express his ideas, although this effort must have been largely due to want of habitude. His self-estimation was further influenced, no doubt, by the grade-numbers that two itinerant phrenologists had assigned to his bumps of language.

At the age of fourteen his school days were brought to a close, and after a few months he joined his eldest brother, who was a surveyor. Alfred took very kindly to this business. The alternation of outdoor and indoor work was greatly to his taste, and the mathematical ingredient attracted him strongly. This is deeply graven in his correspondence. The disposition he has shown through life to express himself in maps and diagrams, together with his love of regularity and order, may incline us to think that Wallace is one of the mathematical class of thinkers. Meditation is dialogue. "I says to myself, says I," is the vernacular account of it; and the most minute and tireless study of logic only fortifies this conception. The majority of men commune with themselves in words. The physicist, however, thinks of experimenting, of doing something and awaiting the result. The artist, again, thinks about pictures and visual images, and largely in pictured bits; while the musician thinks about, and in, tones. Finally, the mathematician clothes his thought in mental diagrams, which exhibit regularities and analogies of abstract forms almost quite free from the feelings that would accompany real perceptions. A person who from childhood has habitually made his reflections by experimenting upon mental diagrams, will ordinarily lack the readiness in conversation that belongs to one who has always thought in words, and will naturally infer that he lacks talent for speech when he only lacks practice.

Another part of Wallace's education that must not be altogether forgotten consisted in his spending nearly a year in a silent and contriving trade, that of the watch-cleaner and jeweller. But circumstances carried him back to surveying, and just then the railway fever rose to such a heat that surveyors commanded high pay; so that, though we may be sure that he would not have had the audacity to obtain what some others would, yet in six months he laid up £100. This being increased by a legacy of £50, he was enabled to join his friend, Henry Walter Bates, in a voyage to Pará. Some years earlier, he had become deeply interested in botany; and more recently Bates had drawn him into a passion for beetles and butterflies. Before sailing, he had had the great good luck to secure the services of Mr. Samuel Stevens as his London agent. He remained on the Amazon, Rio Negro, and Uaupes through four years, dispatching collections to Mr. Stevens just sufficient to pay his expenses. On his return voyage he took with him more, to the value of £200, astutely calculating, we may presume, that if he himself got safe to England, so would they. It fell out otherwise. The ship took fire. Wallace was miraculously rescued, and saved only his life and a few sovereigns. The trusty Stevens, however, had of his own motion insured the specimens for £150, and lo! this was paid. He now wrote and published two books, which just paid the printer, the *time* being a dead loss, from a monetary point of view. He next desired to go collecting in the Malay Islands, and, after much difficulty and delay, Government, at the instance of Sir Roderick Murchison, who was no ordinary scientist, but a swell, presented him with a first-class ticket overland to Singapore.

Wallace remained in the Malay Archipelago for eight years, studying the living forms in the forests of the chief islands and many smaller ones. He was thirty-one when he went, thirty-nine when he returned. Those years were passed in intellectual solitude. All that time he hardly spoke except in Malay, a language without abstractions, comparatively. His only constant servant was a native picked up on the north shore of Borneo. That such a life must bring a great but dangerous education to a young man we may be sure. He came home even more ignorant of how to steer his bark than he went out. He had gone for no better reason than that he was captivated by the accounts of the fauna and flora. He had not the slightest idea that he was going to the one country where a collecting naturalist could gather a fortune in specimens. Before he returned, he committed the folly of sending home a paper giving the theory of natural selection, and defending it. Was he a duke or a millionaire, that he could afford to shock every right-minded man with such a theory, whose enormity was aggravated by its being pretty evidently true? Perhaps he thought it his duty to mankind, though mankind decidedly thought not; yet even when he learned that Darwin had long had in hand a great work to the same purport, he had not the common sense to suppress his own book, and sink it deeper than ever plummet sounded. His conception of Natural Selection (at least, as he now holds it) is superior to Darwin's, in that he maintains that variation in every character of every form is so great in every generation that the vast majority of the young are destroyed without reproducing; so that a new species could be established in a century, if changes in the environment were rapid enough to call for such swift transformation. Of course, such variations exist.

Returning to England, he found he had earned a competence. Let him keep still, leave mankind to shift for itself, and distrust his own potential folly, and a happy life was before him. Alas! his ignorance of the world and want of appreciation of that ignorance were such that ere long the savings were evaporated, and he found himself in the desperate condition of having to live on his pen. Still, even then, had he written what was most conservative and indisputable, carefully concealing his original power, he might doubtless have obtained an appointment to a position where he could give carefully measured vent to his genius. But, perhaps feeling that he had not been put into the world for that, he preferred defending startling hypotheses that are not of a nature to be verified or disproved by decisive experiment. The result naturally was to press him more and more into byways of thought, diverging constantly further from the sober conservatism of worldly interest. Far be it from us to blame the veteran naturalist whose paradoxes have been so instructive to us. But it concerns us to understand how he came to develop as he did, since several of his arguments must derive much of their weight with the general public from the high scientific standing of their author; and two of the most impressive chapters of the present volumes are calculated and partly intended to produce momentous changes of the reader's opinions largely by force of the confidence he will have come to place in the author's power of eliciting the truth of the matter to which they relate.

We repeat that Wallace is a great scientific reasoner; and of course this implies that he is perfectly fair-minded, and sincerely anxious to do full justice to that side of each question which he combats. We may add that, where he differs most from received opinions, his arguments are in general the most carefully considered and consequently the strongest. Certainly, his argument against vaccination, as it is presented in his 'Studies,' is extremely strong. The presentation of it in his 'Wonderful Century' has been more admired by lawyers, but its force is too much directed against refuting his opponents rather than to studying the facts of the case.

The spiritualistic experiences detailed in the second volume of 'My Life' simply cannot be read by any person of open mind without producing a strong impression. But the author admits that the impressive phenomena come very rarely; and when we turn to such a book as Arthur Lillie's account of his friend, the Rev. William Stainton Moses, who was probably in all respects that one of the powerful mediums who most inspires confidence, and there see in what an ocean of incredible nonsense the manifestations are swamped, we ask ourselves whether it is possible for anybody to hold his attention long upon such dire rubbish without great danger of being thrown into such an abnormal state of mind that his testimony may perhaps be no better than that of a person in an hypnotic trance. At any rate, it is the most unwholesome nutriment for the mind, and we are glad that Mr. Wallace did not long continue his active interest in it.

His Socialistic doctrine, which seems to be of a variety peculiar to himself, rests wholly upon a definition of justice as requiring that every child shall have, in every respect, an opportunity precisely equal to every other's. He seems to think it an axiom that such justice ought to be carried out. It is a kind of justice singularly at variance with the dealings of nature with individuals. It could only be remote from viva-voce criticism and discussion that such a proposition could in his mind be metamorphosed from being a thing impossible to believe to being a thing impossible to doubt.

To sum up, this is certainly a very entertaining book, highly instructive in several distinct ways. The volumes are very attractively clothed, and there is an index of near fifty pages.

THE AMERICAN NATION UP TO '89.

Preliminaries of the Revolution, 1763-1775. By George Elliott Howard. [The American Nation, vol. viii.] Pp. xviii., 359. Harpers. 1905.

The American Revolution, 1776-1783. By Claude Halstead Van Tyne. [The Ameri-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can Nation, vol. ix.] Pp. xix., 369. Harpers. 1905.

The Confederation and the Constitution, 1783-1789. By Andrew C. McLaughlin. (The American Nation, vol. x.) Pp. xix., 348. Harpers. 1905.

The two volumes of Professor Hart's "American Nation" series which deal with the period of the Revolution will doubtless prove, to many readers, the most interesting volumes yet issued. In amount of matter and in general scope they naturally suggest comparison with the well-known work of John Fiske, but there is little besides the title in which the two works accord. In purely literary interest, and in the sure feeling for what is effective or dramatic in historical events, Fiske's superiority is unquestionable; but in just balance and proportion, in thoroughness of research, and in all-round attention to the various aspects of the subject, the volumes before us are far better, not only than Fiske's work, but also than any other account of the American Revolution of equal compass.

The distinctive character of the work of Professors Howard and Van Tyne will appear from an enumeration of the topics which the authors have included in their account of the Revolution, but which other writers have either omitted altogether or treated scantily or incidentally. Thus, Professor Howard begins with chapters on the Seven Years' War as "revealing an American people," on the British Empire under George III., and on the mercantile colonial system. A clear and unusually full account of the Stamp Act and Townshend Acts prepares the way for a discussion of episcopacy as a cause of the Revolution. The episcopal motive, first strongly urged by Mellen Chamberlain in his essay on John Adams, proved a prolific raiser of doubts to historians until Dr. Arthur L. Cross examined it in his 'Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies.' Professor Howard adopts Dr. Cross's conclusion that "the strained relations which heralded the War of Independence strengthened the opposition to episcopacy, rather than that religious differences were a prime moving cause of political alienation" (p. 221). Of the remaining chapters, those on institutional beginnings in the West and on the early treatment of the Loyalists are the most distinctive.

Professor Van Tyne, who takes up the story at the outbreak of hostilities in 1775, prefaces his account with a summary review of the ground covered by Professor Howard—an instance of needless overlapping which this series for the first time presents—and then proceeds with a narrative in which purely military events are subordinated and attention centred with unusual directness on the civil history of the States and the work of the Continental Congress. On the subject of the Loyalists, and in general on the relations between Whigs and Tories, the author is an authority, and his treatment of the matter in the present work is of a high order. Both volumes are, as usual, well furnished with maps, while the bibliographical chapters survey the principal literature.

From the numerous interesting points which these volumes present, we select two only for brief special comment. The first is as to the light which the writers, particularly Professor Howard, have thrown on the vexed question of the cause of the Revolution. Speaking broadly, one may say that historians have tended to emphasize the political aspects of the early Revolutionary struggle, and to point out that it was apprehension rather than grievance that drove the colonies to revolt. The trouble with this theory is that it too much disregards the economic situation in America, and appears less conclusive the more the economic situation is revealed. On this fundamental point Professor Howard does not seem to us entirely clear. He tells us (pp. 64, 65), speaking of the old colonial system, that although the system as actually administered "did not prevent the great material prosperity of the colonists," and though "even the harsh restraint of manufacturers was quietly accepted," yet the system is nevertheless to be "regarded as the primary cause of the Revolution," for the reason that "it was wrong in principle and degrading in motive."

We have to confess to finding this confusing. It would be difficult to instance a social upheaval at all comparable to the American Revolution which was brought about by revolt against a system, of which one could only say that it was "wrong in principle and degrading in motive." If the restrictive system actually interfered but slightly with the prosperity of the colonies, one can but wonder why the colonies revolted at it. The case seems to be, rather, that the Americans were poor, that they profited much less than has commonly been supposed from the lax enforcement of the trade laws, and that under the restrictive system there was small chance of accumulating either capital or wealth. When, then, the Sugar Act, the Stamp Act, and the Townsend Acts undertook to take money from America directly, in addition to what had previously been exacted indirectly, the people rebelled because they could pay no more. In other words, the American Revolution, like other revolutions, shows how the political motive—naturally the one to be emphasized to the world at large—waits on the economic motive and then supplants it. Professor Howard has given us an admirable survey of the political side of the early Revolutionary period, but he has not, we think, sufficiently shown how the low economic development of the colonies, and the consequent inability of the people to pay greater tribute to the mother country than they had long been doing, bred certain revolt when pressure grew too great, and afforded the indispensable basis for political agitation from 1770 to 1775.

The second point is suggested by Professor Van Tyne's discussion of the relation of the States to the general Government under the Continental Congress. Of the many prepossessions with which the study of American history has been approached, none has come to be more dominant than that which ascribes to the United States, as against the States, the possession of sovereignty, and that, too, from the beginning of federal union. The theory has the support of great names. It has been employed for the triumphant vindication of the national as opposed to the State-rights view of the Constitution. It is the accepted opinion of the Supreme Court. It has never, indeed, satisfied historians. President (then Professor) Woodrow Wilson challenged it, a dozen years ago, in his 'Division and Reunion,' and made no small stir by doing so; for his statement that "the doctrine that the States had individually become sovereign bodies when they emerged from their condition of subjection to Great Britain as colonies, and that they had not lost their individual sovereignty by entering the Union, was a doctrine accepted almost without question, even by the courts, for quite thirty years after the formation of the Government" ('Division and Reunion,' p. 45), appeared to not a few legalists to justify the essential positions of Hayne, Calhoun, and all the rest of the State-rights leaders.

Professor Van Tyne, writing as an historian, rather than a lawyer, has tested the theory by the facts so far as the origin of State and national Governments is concerned, and with the result of showing, we think with near approach to conclusiveness, that the notion of national sovereignty and State subordination, however inevitable as a constitutional theory later, has in the Revolutionary period only a slender historical foundation. If anything is clear beyong cavil from Professor Van Tyne's imposing array of evidence, it is that the States, throughout the Revolution, were practically independent sovereignties, acting together, it is true, for the attainment of certain common ends, but surrendering none of their sovereign powers in so doing. This is not the place to indicate the bearing of Professor Van Tyne's conclusions on the subsequent constitutional development of the United States. It will certainly be interesting to see how far later writers in the "American Nation" series agree with him. It may be pointed out, however, that his findings have marked significance for the constitutional discussions of the first thirty years of the constitutional period, that they give a new meaning to Webster's great victory over Hayne, and that they afford food for thought in our own day, when the federal powers are undergoing such extraordinary expansion.

In his editorial introduction to Professor McLaughlin's volume, Professor Hart observes that, notwithstanding the familiar designation of the years from 1783 to 1789 as the "critical period" of American history, it nevertheless "seems doubtful whether it was really a time of such danger of national dissolution as people then and since have supposed." We question if a careful reading of this volume will materially dim the impression of the period as one of grave crisis and serious public danger, but there will be general accord with Professor Hart's further observation that the work tends to show "a more orderly, logical, and inevitable march of events than has commonly been described." The book is, indeed, an important contribution to our knowledge of an obscure and little-known period, and may be expected to become the recognized authority, in moderate compass, on the events with which it deals.

The fundamental problem of the period, as Professor McLaughlin views it, was that of imperial organization. Out of the varied elements afforded by thirteen different communities was to be formed, if possible, a national government. Those communities, though forming from north to south a continuous line, were extensively dispersed,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They had had diverse origins; and were still, at the end of a joint war, widely different, not only in natural resources, but also in the character of their people, in their local political institutions, and in their ambitions and hopes. Jealous of one another, they were still more jealous of any central authority that should attempt to control them; for they had fought a long and costly war against imperial authority, and were little disposed to replace one *imperium* by another. Yet it was equally clear that their prosperity, if not, indeed, their independence, hung upon union. The problem was the reconciliation of these opposing forces, the harmonizing of these apparently irreconcilable differences. That the people of the United States should have succeeded, in the short space of seven years, in constructing a "new roof" under which all could eventually gather, and which, with some extensions and alterations, serves to-day better even than it served then, is one of the marvels of modern history.

This is not the place to comment in detail on the numerous points on which Professor McLaughlin's researches throw new light, or in regard to which he has summarized with skill the conclusions of others. The narrative begins with the last military operations of the war, and ends with the ratification of the Constitution by the States. One notices throughout, in the discussion of diplomatic questions, the favorable attitude towards Jay, whose career as a diplomatist has hardly received due appreciation at the hands of scholars. On the much-debated question of the attitude of Vergennes during the peace negotiations, Professor McLaughlin, while recognizing Jay's "admirable boldness" in taking heavy responsibility before the arrival of Adams, reaches also the cautious conclusion that Jay was "somewhat too suspicious of France," that "there is as yet no evidence that [Vergennes] had much at heart the limitation of America's territory," and that Franklin, who had laid the plans for the negotiations, would not "easily" have "surrendered any of the American claims" (pp. 31, 32). A similar friendliness towards Madison appears in the account of the Federal Convention and elsewhere. May it not be that the exceeding value of Madison's 'Notes' has led to some overestimate of his actual influence in shaping the Constitution, and that there were other members of the Convention—for example, Oliver Ellsworth—whose influence has not yet been given due weight?

The diplomatic relations of the United States between 1783 and 1789, especially those with Spain over the navigation of the Mississippi, are skilfully traced, with severe but merited condemnation of Wilkinson for his shady intrigues. There are informing, though brief, chapters on the organization of the Northwest Territory and the founding of new Western commonwealths, though both the Ordinance of 1787 and the public-land system would seem to merit a more extended treatment. The harsh handling of Loyalists after the peace, the disastrous experiments of States and nation with paper money, and Shays's rebellion are other main topics to whose better understanding the volume makes more or less significant contributions. If Professor McLaughlin's work were designed for a textbook, it would quite certainly not find favor in Rhode Island, for in no recent work which has come under our eye have the early financial vagaries of that commonwealth been more roundly scored.

About half of the volume is devoted to the formation and adoption of the Federal Constitution. As a clear and orderly account of events, from the first proposals to alter the Articles of Confederation to the enthronement of the Constitution as the law of the land, the chapters leave little to be desired; for while the detailed story of a constitutional convention can hardly be made entertaining, Professor McLaughlin does write interestingly and handles facts skilfully. At one important point, however, we think his narrative incomplete. No writer, so far as we recall, has yet given an entirely satisfactory explanation of the speedy and marked success of the Constitution and of the government under it. The usual explanation has been, of course, that the Constitution was superior to the Articles of Confederation; and writers have vied with one another in pointing out the defects and weaknesses of the earlier instrument. Professor McLaughlin, it should be said, does not share this view; on the contrary, he is of the opinion that the Articles "were in many respects models of what articles of confederation ought to be, an advance on previous instruments of like kind in the world's history"; and that "their inadequacy arose from the fact that a mere confederacy of sovereign States was not adapted to the social, political, and industrial needs of the time" (p. 49).

A complete answer to the query as to the reasons for the success of the Constitution would take us outside the chronological limits of Professor McLaughlin's book. What, however, the author has not brought out with sufficient clearness is the economic preparation for the Constitution in the revival of trade, manufactures, commerce, agriculture, and the fisheries during the last years of the Confederation. He gives us, to be sure, two chapters on commercial and financial conditions, but the narrative stops with 1786, thus largely dropping out of sight the economic activities of the United States for the three years immediately preceding the inauguration of the government under the Constitution. There seems to be reason for believing that, while the Articles of Confederation became discredited because of the wretched condition of the country in 1781 and immediately thereafter, they might very possibly have worked fairly well for some years after 1787 had not the demand for a "more perfect union" fortunately reached a climax at that time; and that the adoption of the Constitution, coinciding as it did with a return of prosperity, ensured for that instrument a success which otherwise might well have been partial and delayed. Professor McLaughlin's presentation of the political history of the Confederation period is, as a whole, of such merit that we can but regret that he has not ploughed more deeply in the economic field.

Irish History and the Irish Question. By Goldwin Smith. McClure, Phillips & Co. 1905. Pages 270.

A history of Ireland from the earliest times, compressed into less than 200 pages, must necessarily be little more than an imperfect sketch, however skilfully the compression is made. Professor Smith's account is concise to a degree that is actually misleading. Excessive compression may account for his very positive statements of facts not clearly known, for his explicit descriptions of ancient customs, of events shrouded in the mists of ages, of ancient laws which the most learned antiquarians have hesitated to speak of positively. Examples are his description of tribal land tenures; his statement that "there seem to be no remains clearly Druidic in Ireland," though the numerous cromlechs and stone circles for which Ireland is so remarkable are usually held to be Druidic, and Druids are specifically mentioned in ancient legends. Topical nomenclature, too, seems to attest their existence.

The rapid sketch of the chief events of Irish history does not profess to be founded on any original research or independent study. It is a brilliant and lucid recital of well-known facts, of many incidents that are well known not to be true, or that are at any rate doubtful. The story is throughout strongly tinged with Mr. Smith's own views, which are markedly anti-Irish and anti-Catholic, and is plainly used as a peg on which to hang his opinions on the "Irish question," *i. e.*, the present state of Ireland, and the causes of the lamentable decay, poverty, and depopulation we are now witnessing.

With surprising frankness, shall we say? Mr. Smith tells, in his preface, what opportunities he had for forming these opinions. He spent a summer forty-six years ago in Phœnix Park as guest of Chief Secretary Cardwell, and there "had the advantage" of discussing the Irish question with "such friends as Lord Chancellor O'Hagan, Robert Lowe, Sir Alexander MacDonald, and other Irish Liberals of the moderate school"; he visited Maynooth College and "conversed with its excellent principal," and, some years later, when attending the Social Science Congress, was the guest of Lord O'Hagan in Dublin. His confidence in the wisdom of his Irish friends and instructors has remained unshaken, or rather has been strengthened by the course of events.

The view that "the sources of Ireland's sorrows are to be found in natural circumstance and historical fact rather than in the crimes and follies of man," is sufficiently refuted by the grim facts of history as sketched by Professor Smith. That "interest of every kind seems to enjoin the union of the islands" is a somewhat vague statement which suggests the questions, Whose interest? and, What kind of union? The government of Ireland as a subordinated and conquered country by England has never been what could be called a union. After describing the horrors of the famine and accompanying pestilence, the savage clearances and heartless evictions, the consequent dire suffering and misery, Mr. Smith says: "Civilized Europe could show nothing like it. It was enough to break for ever the spirit of the nation, . . . and here the main cause was *misgovernment and bad law.*" According to current English ideas and those of the mild Anglo-Irish reformers of 1860, in whom Mr. Smith places his confidence, Ireland was and is by nature a grazing country; destined to pasture; un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

suited to tillage"; "overpopulated"—"the people priest-ridden"; "early marriages encouraged by the priests, perhaps not without an eye to fees"; the people prone to commit causeless outrages, for which repression by continual Coercion Acts is the only remedy unless Government abdicates. These ideas are still current among some Englishmen, and are apparently held by Mr. Smith. When it is shown that there is much less crime in Ireland than in England, the usual answer is that if there is not overt crime, the country reeks with "sedition," *i. e.*, discontent—a mental crime.

Mr. Smith is very convinced and positive on the subject of overpopulation. It is still a question with him whether Ireland can support her present population of 4.4 millions. Speaking of the early part of last century, he says: "The millions had gone on multiplying with animal recklessness." "Between 1801 and 1841 the population had increased by three millions." Whether such increase is reckless, can be judged only by comparison with other countries. No census was taken in Ireland until 1821, but the accepted estimate of population in 1801 was 5,395,000. In 1841 the population was 8,199,853, an increase of 54 per cent. During the same period in England the increase of population was 77 per cent., and in Scotland 63 per cent. Between 1821 and 1841 the increase in Ireland was 20 per cent., while in England it was 33 per cent. Even before the famine, Ireland showed that tendency to a low birth-rate which has since increased and been the wonder of all vital statisticians. If the Catholic priests have inculcated early marriages, they have been singularly unsuccessful in Ireland, for the marriage-rate has for more than fifty years, during which it has been under observation, been exceptionally low as compared with other countries. Bertillon, in his 'Cours de Statistique,' says: "En Irelande, la proportion des femmes mariées est extrêmement faible, et de plus elles ne sont pas plus fécondes que celles de Suisse."

With regard to the alleged influence of the Catholic priests in politics it may be noted that they have openly opposed every popular movement during the last century, but after a time they had to follow the people; they were led rather than leaders. As a body they opposed the 1848 uprising; they gave information to the Government of the abortive Phœnix conspiracy; they denounced the Fenian and Land League movements. Yet the leaders of these movements have been those whom the people still delight to honor. The convicted rebels John Mitchel and O'Donovan Rossa were elected to Parliament in spite of the priests. "No priest in politics" became a watchword in some districts. "We will take our religion from Rome, not our politics," was the repeated declaration of the National League leaders. In Home Rule elections Protestant Home Rulers defeated Catholic candidates supported by the clergy. In the face of such facts, what meaning is to be attached to the term "priest-ridden"? Equally unsupportable is the allegation that the priest has "discouraged and thwarted the extension of popular education." The Catholic clergy have covered the most desolate parts of the country with schools, nearly all of which are placed under the control of the National Board of Education, on which, in proportion to their numbers, the Catholics are very inadequately represented. Educational experts sent from England to report on the Irish schools have found the most efficient to be those managed and taught by nuns and Christian brothers.

One of the most striking misconceptions is with regard to the objects of the Gaelic League, which Mr. Smith trusts will "hardly carry its patriotism so far as to darken its mind by unlearning English." Again, it is stated that the office of Lord Lieutenant has been retained only in deference to the wish of Ireland. This is a subject on which public opinion has not been expressed for some years, but the published constitution of the National League stated one of its objects to be "the abolition of the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland." For a final criticism, Ireland "received," says Mr. Smith, "the boon of national and undenominational education a generation before England." Now the primary schools in Ireland are called National schools, but education is neither universal nor compulsory. It is strictly denominational, to such an extent that where the population of any locality consists of different religious sects, each may have a separate school. Thus, besides a Protestant and a Catholic school, there may be also a Presbyterian and a Methodist school in the same district—four bad schools in mean buildings in place of one good school with efficient teachers and suitable appliances.

Mr. Smith draws a gloomy picture of an independent Ireland, "severed from Great Britain"; but no representative politicians propose, or ever proposed, such a severance as he contemplates. The importance of the Irish question, on the other hand, he recognizes in his concluding sentence: "What far-off object of aggrandizement can be half so important as a contented and loyal Ireland?"

Impressions of Japanese Architecture and the Allied Arts. By Ralph Adams Cram. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co. 1905. Pp. xi, 227.

Arts and Crafts of Old Japan. By Stewart Dick. Edinburgh: T. N. Foulis; Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co. 1905. Pp. 153.

Mr. Cram's book contains fifty-two half-tone prints in brown. There are landscape subjects, such as Plate I., "Lord Fuji," that is to say, Fuji-San, or Fujiyama, and Plate LII., "A Vision of Fujiyama." There are also subjects of mingled landscape and human art, as in the distant and nearer views of buildings seen with their surroundings, such as Plate XXVI., "Narita Steps," Plate XLI., "A Farmhouse," with Fuji in the background, and Plate XVIII., "A Torii," with lake and mountain beyond. Then there are views of buildings, selected with special regard to their architectural character, such as Plate VI., the "Yakushiji Pagoda," the same picture as that given in the illustration to this author's article on Japan in the 'Dictionary of Architecture and Building.' The argument as to the supreme excellence of this pagoda is hard to follow without other photographs, taken, moreover, from other points of view for comparison's sake. Other such pictures are those of the Ho-o-do at Uji, Plates VII. and VIII. This building also is given and considered by Mr. Cram in his Dictionary article named above. It is therefore evident that these buildings are selected by our author with special regard to their supreme importance in the history of architectural art in the Far East. For, it must be said here, Mr. Cram's assumption is that the beauty of curve in the overhanging and ribbed roofs of these pagodas is the chief thing in their design, or in the external architecture of Japan. Now such refinements are out of the way in all modern European designing, and are only slightly affected by the great styles of the past—by that of the earlier Renaissance, by Greek art in its prime, by the most advanced period of the Romanesque; while the creators of great building styles, Egyptian and Gothic, for instance, were too busy to care supremely for subtleties of curve and slope. Hence most designers in architecture live and die without any aspiration toward such exquisiteness of curvature as Mr. Cram finds in those early existing wooden towers of Japan. So with the sanctuary at Uji named above, the terms used in connection with it are such as these—"the almost inconceivable grace and dignity of this unique building," "this wonderful building," "exquisite as this building is from without." And if we quote these strong words of praise, it is with the single purpose of explaining to the reader what kind of a book he has before him. It is the work of a man who finds perfected Japanese designs as nearly supreme as any decorative art in the world can be. He says (p. 81) that "Japanese architecture is at first absolutely baffling, ... so utterly foreign, so radically different in its genesis, so aloof in its moods and motives from the standards of the West." It is shown with perfect truth and with suggestive touches that the training of the European mind has been on wholly different lines, and that though we can "think forward in the terms of the West, we can hardly think backward in the terms of the mysterious East."

For good and for evil, then, we have a book of extreme subtlety of thought, which is increased by the strongly religious turn that all Mr. Cram's reasoning is apt to take. In the second page of the text (p. 16) there is reference to divine revelation, and the whole of the first chapter is composed with an overhanging sense of the direct divine inspiration of human enlightenment. The reader may confess to an imperfect understanding of the argument on page 22, as to the small influence of the successive religious creeds or practices upon the immutable civilization of Japan; but the critical tone of that first chapter is faultless, and it is well for every student of the subject to read it over more than once before undertaking the severely abstract reasoning of Chapter II., which deals with the early architecture of Japan.

Chapter III. treats of the later architecture of the country; Chapters IV. and V., of temples and shrines and temple-gardens; Chapter VI., of domestic interiors; three chapters still, of sculpture and portable works of decoration, while the tenth and final chapter is a rather hopeless forecasting of what may perhaps come to replace the presumably dead art of Old Japan by a new art of their own, not to be confound-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ed with that of European origin. In all this the same intelligent sympathy guides the observer, both in what is said (pp. 135-136) of the superior taste and delicacy of the Japanese interior, and in the close examination of pictorial art in the Far East in the chapter devoted to "A Color Print of Yeizan."

The book on 'Arts and Crafts of Old Japan' is confessedly a study of the fine arts of Japan, for although the term "arts and crafts" is generally taken as meaning decorative arts only, and those minor ones, yet it is properly used by Mr. Dick to include painting of landscape, of human character and of incident; and bronze statuary, even of colossal scale. The book has about thirty half-tone plates, each one representing either a single large work of art or a number of smaller objects. Three or four landscape paintings are reproduced from the originals in the British Museum or in private hands, and, in like manner, ancient paintings of legend or of animal character are given, together with a few figure studies in wood-cuts, in black-and-white work, in India ink, or in painting. Three plates are devoted to that wonderful varnish painting which we call lacquer-work (though, or course, there is no *lac* anywhere about it), and these pieces are well chosen, for it was necessary to show a number of designs, and therefore we have in two plates eight *inro*, or portable medicine or perfume-cases, and another plate with one larger piece—the top of a writing-case—which is probably a foot long. Metal work and keramics each have three pictures, and of these it may be said that there is perhaps not such a perfect choice made, as some of the pieces seem to be modern in spirit; but the three illustrations to the chapter on sculpture and carving are admirably chosen.

As for the text, we are impressed with the sincerely sympathetic feeling of the critical examination. The book passes for a small and inexpensive guide to Japanese decorative art, but the descriptions and comments are full of a very delicate perception. The book seems also the best familiar study we have seen of the visible, tangible work of art which we get from Japan, as distinguished from the subtle influences which lie back of it.

Les Deux Frances et leurs Origines Historiques. Par Paul Seippel. Lausanne: Payot & Cie; Paris: Félix Alcan. 1905.

That this work has attracted immediate attention and stirred up lively discussion in central Europe, is in no wise surprising. Its author, a professor in the Federal Polytechnic School at Zurich, aims at establishing a comprehensive psychological thesis as preliminary to the political, and still profounder moral, lesson which he, as a Swiss of the broadest liberal school, would suggest to his French neighbors—his kin in race and speech if not in faith. Dealing with a vast historical generalization (to which ample reference will presently be made), the contention passes with easy strides to a possible application of wholesome and revivifying principles, all but lost sight of amid the rending passions over the struggle for power that has seemed within recent memory not merely to forebode a sundering of the integrity of the republic, but even to threaten national existence itself. The utterance of such deliverances in a tone of philosophical manliness, rising at times to the thrill of polemical ardor, is indeed a triumphant witness to the heritage of political discipline.

By "Les Deux Frances" M. Seippel means the two forces now at death-grips over the settlement of paramountcy in the State in matters ecclesiastical, both of equal intolerance and resolute in defending to the death the right of absolute power and final appeal. The intensity of this contest (which it is all but impossible for the average American to appreciate) is, according to the author, the unmistakable sign of the enduring *mentalité romaine*, the historical origin and implanting of which it is the chief object of this book to set forth, while pointing out at the same time that the initial impress, never obliterated, has ever been the great determinant in the moral and religious movements of *orthodox* France, under every régime. This spirit of absolutism M. Seippel conveys in a singularly bold figure:

"Le virus romain, issu de la décomposition du Bas-Empire, a été inoculé à un organisme jeune et plein de santé; son influence pernicieuse ne s'est fait sentir que graduellement et par des accidents d'une gravité croissante, à mesure que diminuait la force de résistance des tissus cellulaires. Les symptômes très variables de la maladie sont apparus avec une évidence particulière au moment des grandes crises, en particulier aux époques de la Réforme et de la Révolution. Et ce n'est pas seulement la vie politique de la nation qui en a été atteinte, c'est surtout la vie morale et religieuse. De l'ordre temporel, l'esprit césarien s'est communiqué à l'ordre spirituel" (Intr. xxix).

For this sweeping statement the author looks for verification in writers typical of successive periods, in each of whom he finds unswerving dogmatic fidelity to this or that universal creed—Calvin, Bossuet, Voltaire, Rousseau, Robespierre, Sieyès, Joseph de Maistre, and so on down to Comte and Brunetière. The list is a formidable one; every member in turn seeks to impose his ultimatum on the nation, even the professed liberals maintaining the "despotism of liberty" (p. 122): "Il y a toujours en France quelques docteurs de cette école-là" (p. 164). M. Seippel might feel surprised at finding himself here in unison with Paul de Kock, who in a sketch (1844) declared the motto of the boiling reformer to be "Je veux que le monde ait la liberté de faire tout ce que *je voudrai*." When temporary success attends either party, there promptly ensues the endeavor to establish a "delegation of conscience," involving submission to an allegiance strangely akin to the fealty exacted by our own labor unions but recently discussed in these columns; for through the manifold catechisms of what M. Seippel sarcastically calls "L'Église de la Libre Pensée," any reader may detect that its votaries are properly described as merely *inverted clericals*. What the author declares concerning the espionage on the private religious practice of officials (p. 273) has been attested to the present reviewer by immediate sufferers in ample number, who explained the difficulty (in certain communities) for an officer or a schoolmaster to countenance the piety of his own family while seeking to remain *bien vu*. And M. Seippel distributes his strictures impartially.

In the same spirit he discusses (ch. xxi.) a number of so-called conversions—more properly, defections—to which the literary reputation of the penitents has given unwonted éclat. The resultant professions of faith, he holds, have naught in common with that of the Port-Royal recluses, any more than their noisy conversions can be likened unto that of Pascal: "C'est une religion d'utilité sociale, faite pour contenir les uns et pour rassurer les autres: la religion de la prudence, si ce n'est la religion de la peur" (p. 332). Throughout the recent struggle, M. Seippel professes to see no religious element whatever, while in the great crisis of the Reformation, religion, if not the sole, was the chief contention. On both sides to-day, he says, not a thought is given to it; the arguments adduced are exclusively political, to the obscuring of the one essential fact that, if true religion be still alive, politics will be powerless to eradicate it; while, supposing it to be already more than half extinct, its revival may safely be expected from persecution.

To discuss seriatim the various points raised in a carefully documented work of four hundred pages is well-nigh out of the question in a review. The impression that remains with the reader from M Seippel's work is that of somewhat overcharged pessimism—natural enough, perhaps, in an academically liberal Swiss, who seems to take his conclusions from books rather than from first-hand observations of the actual conditions of French social life, so little interfered with, *for the temperate and judicious*, by the inclemency of personal oppression. There may be lack of earnestness over weighty questions; still more, lack of fervor; but the generous confidence in the future which Frévost-Paradol expressed in 1869 in 'La France Nouvelle,' prevents any one closely familiar with the fundamentally serious character of the nation from apprehending a permanent check to liberal ideas from "cette résignation des gens éclairés et le découragement d'un grand nombre de bons citoyens."

On Ten Plays of Shakespeare. By Stopford A. Brooke. Henry Holt & Co. 1905.

Much criticism would become unnecessary if publishers would agree on some convenient way of indicating the precise public for which a book is intended. Sometimes the title gives a clue, sometimes the repute of the author; or in the preface an explicit statement of aim may be made. But frequently, as in the present instance, all these means fail us. The title, 'On Ten Plays of Shakespeare,' might attract a schoolgirl or a select audience of scholars. Mr. Brooke has written works varying so widely in point of appeal as to afford no definite presumption. And there is no preface. Accordingly, it remains for the reviewer to attempt so to describe the present volume as to define the public who may find satisfaction and profit in it.

The essays, then, take the form of a running comment on the plot, characters, and poetry of five of Shakspere's best-known comedies, three tragedies, and two histories. The author has no theory of the drama, no doctrine of Shakspere's development or secret of his personality to exploit. The ten essays are ten independent studies,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and might be printed or read in any order. There is no pretence of adding to the sum of our knowledge of the facts about these plays; nor, indeed, does the author show a profound knowledge of recent scholarship on the subject. It is clear, then, that the book is not aimed at the special student.

Neither will the general reader who knows his Shakspere, but is careless of monographs and *Jahrbücher*, find much satisfaction here. So much of the space is occupied by what such a reader will feel to be needless repetition of the familiar that, in spite of the author's fluency and ease of style, it will seem tedious. A happy phrase, a fresh point of view, a piece of sympathetic insight—these are indeed to be found not infrequently. But one who is familiar with the plays will usually prefer Shakspere's telling of the story, and will wish Mr. Brooke had taken more for granted, and had either put in more plums or had made his pudding smaller.

There remains the audience of beginners. No one who has had opportunity to test how far astray the young student may wander, not merely in the interpretation of character, but even in the understanding of what happens in a play, will deny the usefulness of a book which is not afraid of the obvious in such discussions as these. Mr. Brooke, at least, says the first things first, even if he seldom says the last word on anything. And to this third class of readers the facile eloquence of the style will give pleasure, without the irritation which the more seasoned student feels under the touch of condescension from which the reverend critic is seldom entirely free. It is significant that the three great tragedies of "Hamlet," "Lear," and "Othello" are not among the plays discussed. Yet the essay on "Macbeth" is perhaps the most satisfactory and substantial in the volume. Here, as elsewhere, the criticism of character is more penetrating than that of construction; and what is said of Macbeth himself is as suggestive as sound. Mr. Brooke emphasizes properly the predominance of imagination, and draws a valuable distinction when he points out that Macbeth's early compunctions were due less to conscience than to the sense of honor. He sums him up thus:

"On such a temperament, naturally brave, supernaturally fearful; weak in resolve, strong in imagination; a rude soldier with a poet's heart; honorable, but not having any moral foundation for his honor, without the conscience which is honor's guard; his honor only the custom of his class—on such a temperament falls the heavy temptation of ambition."

With the fundamental problem of Shaksperian tragedy, the attitude towards human life implied in the terrible catastrophes, Mr. Brooke attempts to grapple only in the essay on "Romeo and Juliet"; but here he suffers from comparison with the recent great work of Professor Bradley. His thought has neither the precision nor the depth of that masterly treatment; and the fact that it is easier to read, only confirms our conclusion that the present volume is primarily *virginibus puerisque*.

Renascence Portraits. By Paul Van Dyke, D.D. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1905.

Under the above title, Professor Van Dyke gives in one volume studies of three men nearly contemporary in their activities, and representing different countries as well as different aspects of the Renaissance period. Thomas Cromwell in England, Pietro Aretino in Italy, and the Emperor Maximilian I. in Germany are certainly very striking types of a period fertile in individualities. Dr. Van Dyke's purpose in bringing together in this expanded form the substance of several articles contributed to popular magazines is to interest the general reader in the vivid contrasts of human life presented by each of the subjects he has treated. The transitional character of the age is reflected in the singular personal problem of each person here portrayed. In Cromwell we have a statesman struggling to carry a state through the tortuous ways of a breach with the old religious order and the establishment of a new one on a national basis; in Maximilian, a ruler whose fate it was to find himself the last representative of a theory of universal sovereignty and of the romantic age in a world intensely devoted to the practical problems of national development. In Pietro Aretino we see the literary artist, victim of an æsthetic standard divorced from moral content, compelled to utterance by virtue of his instinctive artistic quality, but without a literary material adequate to his creative powers.

Each of these men was a failure in his line. Cromwell, driven to time-serving, perished with his work undone. Maximilian, swept along for a while by generous ideals of national development, found himself diverted from these, and swamped in the mad race for expansion in Italy. Aretino, admired, feared, and execrated in his day, has left a foul name as his only permanent heritage. It is a grateful subject, and Dr. Van Dyke has done a service in bringing it before English readers. He has read widely and well in the period. His style is pleasant if without distinction. Yet the book as a whole is not convincing. It betrays too clearly its publicistic origin. The general reader, not very familiar with the subject, would hardly feel the elements of unity we have suggested. Even viewed as separate portraits, these studies leave an indistinct impression. The essence of a literary portrait as of a painted one is that it separates its subject from all confusing accessories, and stamps its personality vividly on the mind of the observer. Only in the case of Aretino does Dr. Van Dyke answer to this demand. In the other essays we are let into the workshop a little too intimately. The author has not known how to resist the temptation to wander into much detail that does not bear directly on the impression he wishes to create, and his picture is consequently blurred and inadequate.

An appendix of forty pages discusses the value of Cardinal Pole's 'Apologia ad Carolum Quintum' as a basis for judging the character of Cromwell, and touches incidentally the mooted question whether a certain book which Cromwell offered to lend Pole was Machiavelli's 'Principe.' Dr. Van Dyke offers some plausible reasons for believing that it was not the 'Principle,' but the 'Cortegiano' of Castiglione.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Adams, Samuel, The Writings of. Edited by Harry Alonzo Cushing. Vol. II. Putnams. $5.
Andreas and the Fates of the Apostles. Edited by George P. Knapp. Boston: Ginn & Co.
Beha-Ullah. Les Préceptes du Béhaïsme. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
Brown, Vincent. The Sacred Cup. Putnams. $1.50.
Channing, Edward. The Jeffersonian System. Harpers. $2 net.
Daniell, Walter V. Collectanea Napoleonica. London: Walter V. Daniell.
Elson, Henry William. School History of the United States. Macmillan Co. 90 cents.
Foster, George Burman. The Finality of the Christian Religion. The University of Chicago Press.
Gallaway, Julia R. When the Lilacs Bloom. Boston: Richard G. Badger.
Henderson, T. F. Mary Queen of Scots. 2 vols. Imported by Scribners. $6 net.
Holland, Lord. Further Memories of the Whig Party, 1807-1821. Dutton. $5 net.
Koones, J. Alexander. Everybody's Law Book. Hitchcock Publishing Co.
Liljencrantz, Ottilie A. Randvar the Songsmith. Harpers. $1.50.
Maartens, Maarten. The Healers. Appleton. $1.50.
Mark Twain's Library of Humor. Harpers. $1.50.
Morse, Margaret. The Spirit of the Pines. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.
Müller, J. P. My System. G. E. Stechert & Co.
Ober, Frederick A. Columbus the Discoverer. Harpers. $1 net.
Osbourne, Lloyd. Wild Justice. Appleton. $1.50.
Ostwald, Wilhelm. Individuality and Immortality. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 75 cents.
Papers of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts. Vol. I. Petersburg, Chancellorsville, Gettysburg. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.
Pritchett, Henry S. What is Religion? Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1 net.
Rhodes, Harrison Garfield. The Lady and the Ladder. Doubleday, Page & Co. $1.50.
Robie, Virginia. Historic Styles in Furniture. Chicago: Herbert S. Stone.
Roessler, Arthur. Neu-Dachau. Lemcke & Buechner.
Rose, J. Holland. The Development of the European Nations. Vol. II. Putnams. $2.50.
Sankey, Ira D. Sankey's Story of the Gospel Hymns. Philadelphia: The Sunday School Times. 75 cents.
Spargo, John. The Bitter Cry of the Children. Macmillan Co.
Studies in Verse. The Grafton Press.
Sturgis, Howard Overing. All that was Possible. Putnams. $1.50.
Swayne, Christine Siebeneck. The Visionary and Other Poems. Boston: Richard G. Badger.
Town of Lincoln, Mass., The. 1754-1904. Lincoln.
Willard, Charles Dwight. City Government for Young People. Macmillan Co. 50 cents.
Wordsworth's Guide to the Lakes. Edited by Ernest de Sélincourt. Henry Frowde. 2s. 6d. net.
Yeigh, Kate Westlake. A Specimen Spinster. Philadelphia: The Griffith & Rowland Press.

Lankaster's Extinct Animals

Profusely illustrated. $1.75 net (by mail $1.92).

"A charming book . . . the greatest learning combined with the utmost simplicity of expression . . . a book of intense interest."—*N. Y. Sun.*

"Would have taxed Huxley himself to talk as simply, instructively, and delightfully to young people . . . most lively reading for young or old."—*N. Y. Globe.*

HENRY HOLT & CO., N. Y.

INTERNATIONAL LAW:
A TREATISE

By L. OPPENHEIM, LL.D., Lecturer in Public International Law at the London School of Economics and Political Science (University of London), and member of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science of the University of London; formerly Professor Ordinarius of Law in the University of Basle (Switzerland). In 2 vols. 8vo.

Vol. II. War and Neutrality. 8vo. $6.50, *net*
Vol. I. Peace, 8vo. $6.50, *net*. [*Already published.*]
*** *The set of two vols. will be supplied at $12.00 net.*

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO., New York

THE BURROWS BROTHERS COMPANY
OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

are the leading booksellers in the United States along certain lines. They issue a Catalog of Rare Volumes monthly, and this, together with their List of Publications devoted to American History, will be **SENT FREE** to any one making the request.

THE BEST ANIMAL STORY

RED FOX: RED FOX:

By CHARLES G. D. ROBERTS

Author of "The Heart of the Ancient Wood," "The Kindred of the Wild," etc.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED